

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of J. S. Kirby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Adolph Grabowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Angelo Miletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Nintean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBACHER:

H. R. 3013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3014. A bill for the relief of James L. Stice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

307. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution concurred in by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation with the effect of empowering without restrictions each State to provide in accordance with its needs for the financing from State sources of its unemployment insurance and employment service programs, either through taxation under its unemployment insurance law or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

308. Also, resolution concurred in by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York urging the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 577 or similar legislation designed to safeguard existing military graveyards that are given proper and adequate care by States and/or communities wherein they are located; to the Committee on Public Lands.

309. By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 18 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning and urging the Congress of the United States to enact certain amendments to the grants-in-aid programs of the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

310. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of the highly contagious, infectious, and injurious disease of cattle and other livestock, known as epizootic apthra or, more commonly, hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

311. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 19 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat, and defining that term to include not only crab meat produced in foreign waters, but also crab meat produced, processed, canned, marketed, or distributed by foreign nationals outside the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

312. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Department of New Jersey, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, recommending that adequate funds be appropriated to enable all Air Reserve officers who desire to maintain and increase their flying skill and proficiency to do so, and urging the continued maintenance of adequate Air Reserve flying training facilities at the Newark Municipal Airport until such time as equally adequate and accessible facilities are made available for such Air Reserve flying training; to the Committee on Appropriations.

313. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution passed by executive committee, Department of Wisconsin, American Legion, on September 30, 1947, endorsing Camp McCoy, Wis., as a permanent military training center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

314. Also, petition of a group of citizens of Kenosha, Wis., protesting against the proposed loans to Turkey as being against the best interests of American democracy and world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

315. Also, petition of a group of citizens in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

316. Also, petition of groups of citizens in First Congressional District of Wisconsin urging that communism in this country be stopped and stamped out completely; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

317. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Van Newkirk, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

318. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others (members of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

319. Also, petition of Austin L. Love and others (members of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 3), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

320. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others (delegates from the Townsend Clubs of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we give Thee thanks for good weather and the lovely promises of spring. We thank Thee for good health, good friends, and all the things we so often take for granted. We thank Thee for the keen challenges of

this hour, for work to do that demands the best we have and still finds us inadequate. Then may we seek Thy help, knowing that in partnership with Thee, in applying Thy will to our problems, there shall be no dull moments and no problems beyond solution. God bless us all and help us to be right and to do right. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 9, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 516) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 603. An act to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries;

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation;

H. R. 1099. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H. R. 1350. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes";

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 1888. An act to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2032. An act to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in Allied armed forces during the Second World War;

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2183. An act providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department;

H. R. 2336. An act to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the roll is called, may the Chair recognize the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] so that he may have the floor?

Mr. WHITE. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas. Does he yield for a quorum call?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Capper	George
Baldwin	Chavez	Green
Ball	Connally	Gurney
Bricker	Cooper	Hawkes
Bridges	Cordon	Hayden
Brooks	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Buck	Downey	Hill
Bushfield	Dworshak	Hoey
Butler	Eastland	Holland
Byrd	Eaton	Ives
Cain	Flanders	Jenner
Capehart	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.

Kem	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Knowland	O'Connor	Thye
Langer	O'Daniel	Tobey
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Lucas	Pepper	Umstead
McCarthy	Reed	Vandenberg
McClellan	Robertson, Va.	Watkins
McFarland	Robertson, Wyo.	Wherry
McKellar	Saltonstall	White
Malone	Smith	Wiley
Martin	Sparkman	Williams
Maybank	Stewart	Wilson
Millikin	Taft	Young
Moore	Taylor	
Murray	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "House Joint Resolution 11

"Whereas under our present Federal income-tax laws there exists an area wherein the personal income-tax burden exhibits a gross inequality; and

"Whereas this gross inequality of personal income-tax burden is based on the fact that some of our States by law have adopted a so-called community of interest in property as between husband and wife, giving each spouse a half interest in income of the other; and

"Whereas this community of property interest permits the husband and wife in the community-property States to file separate Federal income-tax returns showing a division of the income between them and thereby to make lower income-tax rates applicable; and

"Whereas in all other States, including Illinois, which do not recognize such community interest in property, the husband and wife are not permitted to divide a spouse's income and a single income-tax return accordingly results in higher tax rates being applicable; and

"Whereas such provision in the Federal income-tax law discriminates against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law to the extent of approximately \$1,000,000,000 annually; and

"Whereas this inequality and discrimination have resulted in recommendations for remedial legislation by the American Bar Association, tax administrators, and others: Therefore be it

*"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That to allow such discrimination and inequality to continue to exist is undemocratic, discriminatory, burdensome, and contrary to the very essence of a tax system which purports to place a fair and equal tax burden on all citizens of the United States, regardless of the State wherein they may reside; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States now assembled be urged to take such steps as may be necessary to remedy this unfair and discriminatory tax burden which is unjustly placed on the citizens of the State of Illinois and that full and favorable consideration be given to proposals allowing division of income for tax purposes between husband and wife in all States of the Union; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois."*

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "Senate Joint Memorial 4

*"To the Congress of the United States, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Hon. E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

*"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents that:*

*"Whereas various acts of Congress have imposed certain restrictions and limitations upon the benefits and awards which are to be paid to veterans of the armed services of the United States and to their beneficiaries, which benefits and awards are to be determined upon an individual income basis; and*



"Whereas these said limitations and restrictions result in a virtual nullification of most of the said awards and benefits to veterans of the armed services of the United States who reside in Alaska, due to the fact that the cost of living is higher than within the continental limits of the United States; and

"Whereas the United States Government is cognizant of the fact that such a condition exists within the Territory of Alaska and has made provision for its employees therein to receive a differential of 25 percent of their base salaries:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the necessary steps be taken to remove all limitations and restrictions as above set forth imposed upon all veterans' benefits as applied to those veterans of the armed services of the United States and their beneficiaries who reside within the Territory of Alaska, and further, that all such benefits and awards to Alaskan veterans and to their beneficiaries be increased by 25 percent.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 4

*"To the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and Delegate from Alaska:*

"Whereas section 27 of the Jones Act (Merchant Marine Act of 1920, 48 U. S. C. A., secs. 861-889) is grossly discriminatory against Alaska in that it requires all shipments originating in the eastern United States and carried across the continent in bond by Canadian Railway to be carried north in American-flag ships, although similar shipments destined for Pacific coast ports in the States may be hauled south in Canadian bottoms; and

"Whereas the original purpose of protecting Puget Sound shipping interests to foster an American coastwise merchant marine as necessary for the national defense has been clearly superseded by the present involvement of the national interest in the growth and development of Alaska; and

"Whereas the strategic importance of Alaska was demonstrated in the last war so that development of Alaska into a strong buffer state is now indispensable to the national interest, and the Territory cannot become a bulwark of strength unless its development be treated as a matter of national policy; and

"Whereas the discrimination of the Jones Act in favor of a few run-down Puget Sound ships is blocking movement of goods and passengers to Alaska in derogation of the Territory's development and the national security; and

"Whereas high freight rates have obstructed Alaska's development for over 30 years, notwithstanding which substantial increases are proposed to bail out the present monopoly of the port of Seattle at the further expense of the industries and consumers of Alaska, and at the cost of sacrificing the otherwise inevitable development of the Territory which is of paramount importance to the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas restoration of Alaska's so-called lifeline, which broke down as a result of long-time shortsightedness and as a consequence of intensive war use and employer-employee controversy, should not be undertaken at the sole expense of Alaskans in the guise of increased rates, especially since the ruinous effect on the Territory would be a serious detriment to the national interest; and

"Whereas freight rates under free competition would open up hauling of cargo from the eastern United States to the port of Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and thence in Canadian bottoms to Alaska coastal points

at two-thirds of the existing rates from Seattle; and

"Whereas the Territory declines to be browbeaten, and does propose to fight increased freight rates with all weapons at its disposal, with the view that the problem should be solved on the national level with temporary relief forthcoming as a sensible, foresighted investment which would pay off manyfold in the years to come, and as the only solution compatible with the national interest:

"Now, therefore, we, your memorialists, do respectfully pray that section 27 of the Jones Act be amended to remove the present discrimination therein contained against the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of 290 citizens of the city of Holton, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT FOR PALESTINE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, headed by a former distinguished Senator, Guy Gillette, of Iowa.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HIGH LIGHTS OF THE PLAN FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF PALESTINE

A plan for the immediate establishment of a provisional government of Palestine was submitted by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation to the General Secretary of the United Nations and to all the individual member governments of the United Nations.

The plan advocates the termination of the British mandate over Palestine and the establishment of the Hebrew national territory as a free democratic republic. It calls for the early convocation of a Hebrew representative assembly which, as the ad hoc representative body of the Hebrew nation, will proclaim to the world the reestablishment of the sovereign state of Palestine—as a free democratic republic with the fullest equality before the law of all citizens, irrespective of creed or national extraction.

It envisages the establishment of a United Nations supervisory board to advise and assist the provisional government in the transition from the mandatory regime to a constitutional republic.

An advisory national council and a temporary judiciary will assist the provisional government in the carrying out of its duties.

The plan stresses, amongst the principles which would constitute the policy of the provisional government, the separation of church and state and universal suffrage, regardless of sex, creed, or descent, to all literate citizens of Palestine; freedom of worship and equality before the law of all citizens, regardless of extraction and religion.

The plan thus envisages a Hebrew Palestinian republic free from either Jewish or Moslem religious domination.

It lists 13 tasks which would be amongst the first to be undertaken by the provisional government. These include the granting, upon application, of Palestinian passports to all Hebrew displaced persons in Europe and the organization of their speedy repatriation to Palestine; the organization of a Palestine army to safeguard the security and tranquility of the country, and the dispatch of diplomatic emissaries to the various capitals of the world as a preliminary to obtaining membership in the United Nations.

The plan offers a complete solution within a period of 2 years, during which all of the Hebrews in Europe would be repatriated to Palestine and become free and useful citizens of an independent republic. The Hebrew Committee points out that no other complete solution has been offered and that the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry merely proposed a continuation of the present unbearable state of affairs.

It will require, the plan states, a smaller effort on the part of the United States Government to have this complete plan carried out than to carry out any one of the fragmentary proposals on which it now works and which leave the question unsolved.

Action on this plan is well under way, and it will be carried out irrespective of the anticipated rejection of the plan by the British Government which had entirely abandoned the mandate and had turned Palestine into an occupied territory ruthlessly subjugated by a military force. It must now be realized, the Hebrew Committee emphasizes, that the issue is a conflict between the oppressed Hebrew nation and the oppressor—the British Empire.

According to the plan, it would most probably become imperative to convene the Hebrew national assembly abroad and to establish a provisional government in exile with several members of the cabinet functioning underground in Palestine.

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 460) to amend section 327 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 96) thereon.

#### REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. THYE, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the bill (S. 28) to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes, reported it without recommendation, and submitted a report (No. 97) thereon.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

James M. Alsup, of Honolulu, T. H., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii, to fill an existing vacancy.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1082. A bill to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1083, for the relief of William Gerald Bishop, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1084. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States

shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1085. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1086. A bill for the relief of Jon Ovezea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1087. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### WILLIAM GERALD BISHOP

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of William Gerald Bishop.

I wish to have it clearly understood that I do not know Mr. Bishop. However, I understand that if he is deported, it will be tantamount to a sentence of death. That is what his lawyer tells me. I believe that in this country every man is entitled to take advantage of every avenue available to him so that he may obtain justice. I am informed by his attorney, whom I have also never met before, that this man has not had justice. By introducing this bill and having the subject brought up before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary, that subcommittee will have charge of this matter and will have an opportunity to investigate it thoroughly. He is to be deported this evening, I understand, and therefore I am introducing this bill at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1083) for the relief of William Gerald Bishop, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1073) to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has agreed this action should be taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 603. An act to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for mili-

tary or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries;

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation;

H. R. 1099. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho;

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1350. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 1888. An act to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II; and

H. R. 2032. An act to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in Allied armed forces during the Second World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 2183. An act providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August

13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2336. An act to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; and

H. R. 2753. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Appropriations Committee, I ask unanimous consent that we be permitted to meet at 2:30 this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

#### THE LILIENTHAL NOMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confirm Lilienthal," published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REASON FOR AID TO GREECE—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of the proposed aid to Greece written by William Philip Simms and published in the Pittsburgh Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we are considering the bill which is now before the Senate in response to President Truman's eloquent message of March 12 appealing to Congress for emergency aid to Greece and Turkey. Mr. President, I desire to express my satisfaction and sense of appreciation at the widespread support by Senators of the President's policy without regard to party affiliations. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in an able and comprehensive address has given wholehearted support to the President's policy. It is gratifying to know that on both sides of the aisle the plan is receiving the approval of the Members of this body. It is of the highest importance that the foreign relations of the United States be conducted without partisanship or political division. Our voice is more persuasive and our influence more compelling when a united Nation and a united people support and sustain them. Our policy is then an American policy without regard to party or faction. Having sat in a number of international conferences, I know how imperative are national unity and cooperation when we face the other nations of the world. I am gratified beyond measure that our foreign relations are



upon a nonpartisan basis and have the support of both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the beginning—and I hope the press will note this statement—that today I speak only for myself. My remarks have not been cleared by anyone save myself. I represent no one here today but myself and, I hope, the American people.

The purpose of the bill in the case of Greece is to extend aid in the amount of \$300,000,000 to the Greek Government for relief to its citizens until Greek economy can be rebuilt, and funds for the equipment of the Greek Army and for its training.

In the case of Turkey, the relief of \$100,000,000 is intended for assistance in Turkey's military program of modernizing its military equipment and in training the armed forces.

The economy of Greece is threatened with total collapse unless emergency aid is quickly granted. Her people suffered the rigors and misery of years of warfare. Attacked on her northern borders and invaded by Italy and Albania, her gallant soldiery fought valiantly and heroically in defending her soil. Finally overwhelmed by the Nazi invasion, her territory was devastated, her people stripped of their possessions, her transportation system and highways largely destroyed and her people plunged into the agonies and horrors of years of a cruel and hostile occupation. She now lies broken and bleeding with her people in dire need of the primary necessities of life. Her government's activity is helpless to restore normal conditions because of the lack of resources and facilities to meet the emergency that threatens her very existence—an emergency that unless aid is granted will submerge that ancient and unhappy land in chaos, confusion, and ruin. These are the fertile soils in which germinate and flourish communism and tragic dislocation of order, of law, and of government itself.

Mr. President, in this connection let us not forget what Greece during the course of her long and distinguished history has done for the world. We must not forget that the very term "democracy" itself comes from two Greek words. We cannot forget that in classic and ancient days Greece, with her literature, her oratory, her statesmanship, her public activities, her literature, her architecture, her sculpture, and her painting contributed mightily to the culture and advancement of civilization. Rome conquered her with armies, but Greece imposed upon Rome the dominion of the mind and spirit, enriching and ennobling the civilization of that era. Greece has been our friend throughout the years, notably since she gained her independence from Turkey in 1820. She is our friend; we have been her friend. We do not today desire to see her become the tragic victim of dark and cruel forces and conditions which would bring about her ruin.

It may be asked why should funds be extended to Greece and Turkey for their military establishments?

The answer is that in Greece armed bands of guerrillas operating chiefly in

the north along the borders of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria have been and are now making war on the Greek Government and people with the intent to overthrow it and to erect in its stead a communistic state.

There is ample evidence that these armed bands are being encouraged, stimulated, and motivated from the states of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, all of which are under the domination of Russia and her communistic system.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article published in last night's Washington Star and written by Constantine Brown, whom many Senators know. The dispatch is from Athens, where Mr. Brown is on tour, surveying world conditions. I quote very briefly:

Estimates of the strength of the Communist military forces which are supporting the Greek guerrillas operating from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania vary from 100,000 to 250,000.

As to those figures, of course, I cannot give approval. I do not know the number. The number, however, is much larger than we had been led heretofore to believe. But here is the main point:

The general headquarters is located at Skopje, Yugoslavia.

The Communist army, the Communist host that is attacking Greece and sowing disaster and disruption throughout Greece, has its headquarters in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia, as all Senators know, is a sycophant of Russia and her communistic system. Through UNRRA we gave Yugoslavia \$400,000,000, so the testimony of Mayor LaGuardia before the committee disclosed. Of that sum the United States paid 70 percent, or \$280,000,000. Today Yugoslavia denounces us and abuses us and challenges us. I shall not mention the incident of the shooting down of our aviators. But, Mr. President, that shows the attitude of Yugoslavia, and when it is known how subservient she is to Russia it is not a very radical conclusion that her conduct now in tolerating the headquarters of the Communist army opposing Greece shows her approval and commendation.

If Greece is to survive as a free nation, if her integrity is to be maintained, if her sovereignty is to be respected, she must have the military means to suppress these lawless bands and to maintain her government and the integrity of her territory and the safety of her people against these evil and insidious influences that seek by infiltration and absorption to pull down the Greek flag and to lift in its stead the banner of communism and chaos and confusion and misery.

Mr. President, by the enactment of this bill we do not send a single combat soldier to Greece. There has been complaint by Mr. Gromyko and others to the effect that we were proposing to send military aid to Greece. Not a single combat soldier will be sent; only a small group of military men to assist in the training of the Greek Army and in teaching it how to utilize the weapons which it has in its hands. The naval forces we propose to send will also be very small;

principally for the aid of Greece in mine-sweeping and activities of that kind, landing craft—all of a very minor character.

It would be futile indeed for economic relief to be extended which would serve the necessities for only a brief period and to permit the submergence of the people and Government to the waves of armed communism beating at their doors and ending in final triumph for these alien and evil influences. In other words, merely to extend small amounts of economic aid to supply her needs for a brief period would be of little avail if in the meantime her Government collapses and the forces of communism take over her Government. If Greece is to live, if there is to be a Greece, she must be given aid to maintain the essentials of law and order, to suppress outlaw bands making war upon her.

The United States is not seeking to intervene in Greece. Whatever we shall do in Greece will be done at the urgent request of the Greek people. We do not propose to dictate to Greece as to the form of government which she may have, or as to her institutions. We do mean to have control of the expenditure of these funds under American supervision in order that they may be utilized for the purposes intended. But the Greek people ought to remain entirely free without any political control or dominance by the United States.

In the case of Turkey, it is in the national interest of the United States that she be extended aid in the form of military equipment or supplies and the training of her armies in order to maintain her sovereignty, her territory, and her security. Turkey, since the beginning of World War II has maintained a large armed force. It has entailed a severe strain upon Turkey's economy. Her need for mobilizing and keeping under arms her military forces is imperative. It is well known that Turkey is under constant threat from abroad and that her security is endangered.

It is well known that Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria are completely under the domination and control of Soviet Russia. They have embraced, either willingly or under the threat of overwhelming armed forces, the doctrines and ideologies of Soviet Russia. They are the obsequious sycophants of Soviet Russia and her doctrine of infiltration and military and political pressure looking to the subjugation of its victims. The world needs but to look about at the unfortunate situation of Poland, of Czechoslovakia with a great and glorious history, and of Rumania, to know how the Russian system has engulfed these unfortunate lands and broken the spirit of their people. In the case of Poland a tremendous Russian army is on her eastern border. Other Russian occupation armies in Germany are on Poland's western border. She is within a vise and is absolutely compelled to respond to the wishes of the Soviets.

Even now in Moscow, Soviet Russia is delaying and blocking action on a peace treaty for Germany. She has an ambition to establish a dominant influence in Germany and to bring a large part of

the territory of Germany within the Soviet system. We want to see Germany reestablished, but she must be stripped of her military power. We want to eradicate the war fever and her ambition for world mastery. We want Germany's economy lifted to a high level. Her continued existence is necessary to European economy.

Soviet Russia, however, wants to implant her ideology, her communistic system in that unhappy land and to bring her people within the Soviet orbit.

Soviet Russia, by her system of spreading creeping paralysis among smaller and weaker nations, hopes to bring about world dominion and to control the destiny of Europe. She hungers for "all the land that joins me." Those words are taken from the story of an old farmer who, upon inquiry, stated that all he wanted was "all the land that 'jines' me."

If Greece and Turkey should fall under the sway of Soviet Russia, Italy would be the next victim of this system of economic, military, and political aggression. "Aggression" is the word, and the correct word. Across the Adriatic from Italy lies Yugoslavia, subservient and obedient to the Soviets, with Marshal Tito, who thinks he is a great military figure, ready to leap at the throat of Italy instantly when the opportunity is presented. That was made clear at Paris, at the Foreign Ministers Council, which some of us attended. Yugoslavia has its hungry eyes set upon Italy. If Greece and Turkey fall, Italy will be the next victim. Should Italy fall, France would be the next objective. From the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, communistic patrols and detachments would cover with their propaganda and their illusive promises that historic land. Austria would succumb to these enervating and weakening influences until her sovereignty was destroyed and her Government dissolved.

The United States wants Russia to have her own Government within her own borders, but no farther. Russia has a right to select her own system of government, but she has no right by political pressure, by the threat of armed force, to sap the strength of independent and sovereign peoples and to so enervate them and strip them of their strength as to be able to bring them under her dominion. Yes, we want Russia to have her own form of government. We want her to be secure within her own boundaries. We should give her assurance of that desire. No one wants to invade Russia, or hamper or interfere with her internal affairs.

During World War II, we sent, from March 1, 1941, to September 30, 1946, \$11,297,883,000 in lend-lease to help Russia maintain her integrity and preserve her Government and assure her security. Is there any hostility in that? We were ready to send lend-lease assistance to Russia in order that she might survive, in order that she might have her own Government, in order that she might have her own institutions. We did not question her form of government or her institutions when we sent that aid. We did not equivocate. We did not hesitate. We did not inquire as to the form

of her government or her institutions. Why does she now oppose our extending similar aid to Greece for the same purposes—for the purpose of maintaining her integrity, of giving security to her people, and of implementing her own institutions?

Russia was an ally during World War II. She was an ally when our country was under arms, fighting the common enemy. We have indulged the hope that in peace she might be our ally as well as in war. We had based our hopes on the thought that the unity of the great powers in the United Nations would preserve peace, would preserve the sanctity of sovereign nations and would guarantee their security and safety.

We want to be friends with Russia. If she wants United States friendship, let her (a) cease to infiltrate other countries; (b) cease to employ her armies as a threat to her neighbors; (c) respect the sovereignty and integrity of other nations; (d) perform her obligations to the United Nations to promote peace and peaceful settlements.

Mr. President, in World War II, we sent our armies and navies to many parts of the world. We poured out in treasure more than three hundred billion dollars. And why? We made these tremendous sacrifices to prevent conquest by arms. Why shall we not now send not armies, not soldiers, but dollars to Greece and Turkey to prevent conquest by all of the devices and methods employed to subjugate peaceful peoples by communistic ideologies? Why shall we not give aid to these countries to enable them in their own right, and in their own dignity and under their own sovereignty, to maintain their integrity and security against the vicious and destructive attacks that threaten them?

Mr. President, in all candor and frankness, one of the motives that prompts me to support this measure is resistance to the aggressive expansionist doctrines of Soviet Russia. Free and independent nations must not be destroyed. Her conquest of these keys to the Mediterranean, to the Middle East, and to the Far East in her mad march toward world dominion must be arrested.

Let me observe here that Greece and Turkey are almost indissolubly linked. If Greece should fall, with her chain of islands extending to the boundaries of Turkey, it would be only a little while until Turkey would be forced to succumb. Aggression feeds upon each success. It is urged on to other conquests, to greater dominion, to a more sweeping extermination of governments and systems, until an outraged world resists and overcomes and drives back its barbaric system.

Greece, unaided and alone, cannot successfully resist the tidal waves of communism nor the sweep of armies supporting it. Turkey, unaided, cannot arrest an attack by a great military power. The aid proposed by this bill must be granted, and granted speedily, if Greece and Turkey are to survive.

There is no conflict between what is proposed in this bill and the functions of the United Nations. The President in his address to the Congress pointed out that the United Nations was equipped

with neither the facilities nor the funds with which to meet the emergent conditions in Greece and Turkey.

President Truman is not justly subject to criticism in this regard. He knows, as we know, and as the United Nations organization and the Security Council know, that the United Nations is not equipped with either the funds or the facilities to render this aid. The United States, through former Senator Austin, its representative in the Security Council, officially advised the Council of the proposed action of the United States and gave assurances to the United Nations that there is involved no desire nor attempt to invade the jurisdiction or authority of the United Nations.

The bill provides, out of an abundance of caution, out of a desire to meet the criticisms, attacks, and suggestions that the problem should go to the United Nations, that whenever the United Nations, either in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, decides to act upon a proposal to extend aid of the kind proposed in the bill, the United States, through the President, will withdraw further aid.

Mr. President, we have gone to the extreme limit in our respect for the United Nations. No one wants to hamper the United Nations. The United Nations, within its particular sphere and within its appropriate jurisdiction, has the loyal support of the United States now, and has had it ever since it was founded at San Francisco. At an early period the United States was one of the leading nations to propose the formation of the United Nations, and we gave it our hearty support in the period of its formation. We have given it our hearty support ever since.

On Monday Mr. Gromyko, the representative to the Security Council from Soviet Russia, made an attack upon the United States because of the provisions of this bill. He asserted that the enactment of the bill would by-pass the United Nations and that any action taken should be by the United Nations. He charged that our aid would constitute intervention in the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. Mr. Gromyko, of course, does not want Greece or Turkey to receive aid either from the United Nations or from the United States. That is my considered belief. If a proposal should be made to the United Nations organization to supply the aid carried in this bill, Mr. Gromyko, as a representative of Soviet Russia, would, according to my belief, promptly interpose a veto as he has done on a number of occasions heretofore. Ten times the Soviet has vetoed action by the Security Council. Mr. Gromyko knows that the United Nations does not possess the funds nor the facilities to grant the required aid. He knows it does not have a dime nor a single soldier to devote to such a cause. He wants to send Greece and Turkey for aid where he knows there is no aid. Mr. Gromyko's sally is a flank movement.

We made loans to Italy, to France, and to other countries, and every one of them was based upon the implication that by the extension of those loans the respective countries could stabilize their economy and prevent or override agitations



of a communistic nature. Who complained that those loans ought to have been made through the United Nations? Where was the champion standing forth then to demand that the appeals of France, Italy, and Great Britain should go to the United Nations? The press carried reports that Russia had made loans to Poland. I never heard of their being submitted to the United Nations.

It is my view that the United States must be frank with Russia and that we must demand frankness of the Soviets. We must proclaim the truth. Let them know where we stand. There is no denial that one of the cardinal purposes of this bill is to enable Greece and Turkey to resist the encroachments of Soviet Russia and her satellite states. Russia is not unaware of this purpose. We should make that purpose clear. We should demand of Russia that she abandon the methods by which she subjugated the satellite states. We should make it plain that as a Nation and a people we shall resist this effort to destroy the independence or integrity of free peoples.

We are devoted to the cause of peace. We have pledged our support, and our loyalty to the United Nations as an organization for the promotion of peace and for the support of free governments.

Read the Charter. Written into that document in the most solemn fashion is the statement that one of the obligations assumed by members of the United Nations is to protect and defend the sovereignty of free peoples and free nations. These are the great objectives of that organization. We shall continue in our devotion to it and its purposes.

We fought World War I and World War II to secure world peace. We came out of those wars without any added territory, without any bounties or reparations. We came out with nothing but enormous sacrifices of blood and treasure which we made toward the establishment of the principle of world peace and respect for nations and their territories and institutions. The aid proposed in this bill is in the interest of and will contribute to world peace. Without such aid war might ultimately develop in those areas. War anywhere on earth is a threat to our peace.

In World War I, by reason of an incident in an obscure town in Europe, we were drawn into that world conflict. In World War II, difficulties over the Polish Corridor, trivial in themselves, finally engulfed us in the most stupendous war in all the pages of history. If we can maintain peace in Greece and Turkey, we will have contributed to the peace of the world. In contributing to the peace of the world we will contribute to our own peace.

However, Mr. President, our own security and the integrity of our territory and our institutions call for our supreme sacrifice and constant concern. We want peace. We crave dominion over no other land. We look with hungry eyes upon no foreign territory. We do not dream of tribute or bounties or subsidies from any other people. We want peace. But there is no absolute assurance of peace unless we in our own strength and resources possess the means of insuring

peace. So long as there exists in the world the evil influence of national ambitions to conquer or subjugate other lands or nations, we must be alert to the dangers to our own security and to the peace of the world. In these troubled days, the United States must maintain its defenses and its armed services. It is the imperative duty of the United States to maintain an army adequate for our defense and capable of being expanded to meet our national requirements. We must maintain the greatest navy that floats upon the seven seas—not for offense, not for conquest, but for the defense of this land and the safety of our people. The United States must maintain the greatest and most efficient air force in the world. World War II has demonstrated the military power of the air services. It wrote a new and startling chapter in the history of warfare. It will grow and develop as a result of scientific invention and through the daring exploits of that arm of the service.

The highest and most compelling duty of the Congress of the United States is to provide for the protection and security of our beloved land and the people of these United States. We must not, we shall not, neglect the imperative duty of adequate national defense. It will not alone give us security at home, but will invest our voice with a strength necessary to carry conviction to lands abroad that we are prepared to fulfill our commitments and obligations in the international field.

Mr. President, throughout the centuries run the dreams of would-be conquerors. Plans for conquest and dominion fill many pages of the solemn history of the world. These dreams were dissipated by outraged people who resisted and crushed them. Communism cannot conquer the world by the devices she now employs. The free peoples of the world are determined to remain free. They will not be deluded by the false and fatuous promises that communism offers. They will resist unto the death. They will determine their own destiny. They will not be coerced by any foreign power or influence.

Let Russia reflect that Mussolini had a dream to build an empire on the ruins of conquered lands. Mussolini's empire was shattered and broken; and Mussolini, its master and author, was interred amidst its ruins.

Let Russia reflect that Hitler, with tremendous resources and a superb army, sought to dominate the world with the sword. He drove his military minions into the heart of Russia itself. But Hitler's far-flung campaigns ended in disaster; and Hitler, the author, perished in the storm that wrecked and destroyed them.

Let not Russia blind her eyes to recent history, nor close them to the lessons of the past. World dominion by a single power will not be achieved as long as freemen know how to resist tyranny, whether threatened by arms or by pressure, infiltration, or absorption. Russia should know that world empire is dead. It must remain dead.

Mr. President, we are standing on the world stage. Small nations and free

peoples everywhere on the globe are looking to us with hope in their hearts and a prayer upon their lips. What we shall do will be recorded in the solemn annals of our time. The United States, with a glorious tradition, faces the judgment of history. The United States, the nursery of liberty since Jefferson flung his flaming declaration into the face of a British king; the United States, the strongest, the richest and the most powerful Nation on the globe, must answer the cry of impoverished and shattered Greece for aid to alleviate the sufferings and hunger of her unhappy people and to strengthen her armed forces, to suppress rebellion, and to preserve her life. We must answer the appeal of Turkey to strengthen and equip her armies, to preserve the integrity of her soil and her rights as a nation. Mr. President, as the greatest champion of democracy in all the centuries that have passed over the hoary head of mother earth, we cannot, we must not, say "No."

HENRY FORD

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at 2:30 this afternoon the State of Michigan is standing by in a memorial moment of devoted tribute to Henry Ford. It is the hour of his funeral. I join in this memorial to a great American, with this brief benediction, though words would be inadequate, even if multiplied ten thousand times:

Mr. Henry Ford's death ends one of the greatest and most thrilling careers in the life of this country. It is the vivid epitome of what one man can do for himself and for his fellow men under our system of American freedoms. Through his own irresistible genius and courage he not only rose from humble obscurity to fame and fortune, but he also founded a new national economy of mass production which blessed his hundreds of thousands of employees with high wages and his millions of customers with low prices. He has probably had as great an impact on his times as if he had been a President of the United States. With it all, he continued always to be a modest, kindly, gentle friend with constant interest in the welfare of his country and of his fellow men. He was a giant in a day of giants. He will never be forgotten.

#### AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to the amendment submitted by the committee on page 7, which I perfected yesterday in one instance. I am desperately anxious to be very sure that the words are utterly beyond any possibility of misunderstanding as to their meaning; namely, that the attitude of the United States is to recognize any action taken by the Security Council with respect to this problem, without counting vetoes. After a further conference with the Acting Secretary of State this morning, I am going to change one more word in the amendment on page 7, in line 24, so that there can be no possibility of doubt as to its meaning.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make such a motion

at the present time, so that we can perfect this document before the general debate begins. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to submit to the committee amendment an amendment changing the first word "the", in line 24, to the word "any."

Mr. PEPPER. Let me inquire what the page is, Mr. President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is on page 7.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the point. Is the word "the" to which the Senator refers, the one appearing in the phrase "exercise of the veto"; and would the change suggested by the Senator from Michigan make those words read "exercise of any veto"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator restate that? I did not quite understand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The words in parentheses at the bottom of page 7 will then read as follows:

(with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto.)

That change would be made so that there can be no question of the fact that we are not hiding behind someone else's veto when the time comes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say in this connection that I shall not object, but I think I approach this matter from a standpoint somewhat different from that of the Senator from Michigan. I do not agree that the Congress can by its enactment waive or in anywise infringe upon the action of the Security Council. Under the Charter, if a nation votes "no"—I refer to any one of the five permanent members—that is a veto. But I agree to the proposition that we can condition our own action with any future event, just so it is an event.

So it is in that spirit that I go along with the Senator, but not with the idea that we can in any wise prescribe how the Security Council shall act or shall function or how it shall count vetoes or not count vetoes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally agree with the analysis made by the Senator from Texas. There is no suggestion here of any attempt to invade the authority of the Security Council to write its own rules. The sole attempt is to set up a rule of conduct by which we shall interpret a vote that is taken in the Security Council under the circumstances indicated. The purpose is that we shall count it as a straight vote, regardless of anyone's right to have his vote counted as a veto within the operations of the Security Council itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean to say, then, that his construction of this provision is that, notwithstanding the

fact that any other nation, which we could not, of course, affect, should exercise the veto, we would not regard that as anything except a negative vote?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The question has occurred to me, and no doubt it occurred to the able Senator in charge of the bill, that this declaration is on the part of Congress. Of course, this is a bill, and therefore it would require the signature of the President. I have no positive views about the subject, but it raises an interesting constitutional question as to whether our veto in due course should be waived by the President of the United States giving direction of our representatives on the UN, or whether the Congress by the enactment of legislation could waive the veto of the United States. I should like to have the views of the able Senator from Michigan upon that point, if it was within the mind of the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not prepared to debate any constitutional question with the able Senator from Florida, because I fully realize that I would have two strikes on me before I started.

I do not think the situation we are considering involves any necessity for that sort of what might be called microscopic examination, because I think this is fundamentally and essentially an assertion of an attitude of good faith. We would say by an act of Congress, signed by the President of the United States, that if "the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto), or the General Assembly finds that action taken, or assistance furnished, by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable," then "the President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein."

Mr. President, I think that is the definition of an attitude. I am perfectly sure that so far as the authors of the bill are concerned it is an attitude which is assumed in 1,000-percent good faith. I am sure it will be accepted on that basis and interpreted upon that basis if any occasion ever arises to challenge it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one remark?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I myself do not think there is a constitutional question in this declaration at all. All that the Congress is doing is laying down a policy. It is constitutional to the extent that Congress, of course, has the right to authorize the President to act, it has the right to direct the President to act. Those things are constitutional. So that the writing of the provision itself is, of course, in keeping with constitutional practices. But the declaration is merely a declaration of policy which implies a consent to a theory. That is as far as this goes. To assume that it takes away the discretion of the President, to assume that he cannot act within his field, a field which is his under the Constitution, that we are trying to limit that, would be entirely wrong. It is a declaration of the good intent of Congress to live in harmony with past declarations which the

Congress has made in adhering to the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I agree with his analysis, and I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 4, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 1, after the word "act", it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "and any necessary expenses related thereto" and the comma.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we face the usual embarrassment and dilemma which usually at about this hour of the day confront a Senator presumptuous enough to think that anything he can say will satisfy Senators as well as the good things they can eat at their lunch period.

I wish to address myself generally to the pending proposal, and I am prepared to do it now; I suppose it will be necessary to do it now, although it is a very unhappy time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hayden	Pepper
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bricker	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Saltonstall
Buck	Ives	Smith
Bushfield	Jenner	Sparkman
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Taft
Cain	Knowland	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Thye
Connally	McCarthy	Tobey
Cooper	McClellan	Tydings
Cordon	McFarland	Umstead
Donnell	McKellar	Vandenberg
Downey	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Eastland	Maybank	White
Eaton	Millikin	Wiley
Flanders	Moore	Williams
Fulbright	Murray	Wilson
George	Myers	Young
Green	O'Connor	
Gurney	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, for a few moments I shall address myself in general terms to the proposal which is now before the Senate, and thereafter I shall address myself to the specific amendments, or substitutes, as they may come severally to the attention of the Senate.

Like millions of other Americans and millions of nationals of other nations



over the world, I keep asking myself what President Roosevelt, as the one principally responsible for the United Nations, would have done, faced with the same situation which faces our Government now in Greece and Turkey. And the reply which keeps coming back to me is the statement of the Manchester Guardian, a world-honored English newspaper, which said, as quoted on March 21 by the New York Herald Tribune:

One feels that, faced with the same situation, President Roosevelt would first have tried to do the same things through the United Nations by enlisting the support of other nations, including Russia if possible. Peace, the status quo, the integrity of nations—these are not exclusively American interests, but the interest of us all.

What is this proposal we now have to approve or reject? It is not a relief bill—because no relief is asked for Turkey, and half of what is asked for Greece is for equipping, training and maintaining a Greek army of 125,000.

Some say it is a momentous new doctrine and they compare it to the Monroe Doctrine except that it extends to the whole world and not merely to the Western Hemisphere. Some say it is a showdown with Russia and that we have determined to join issue with the Russians at every point of their circumstance.

Others say that we have determined to stop communism and now accept its challenge in every continent and country and clime.

Others say it divides the world into two spheres, the East and the West. For example, the Stockholm Expressen says:

In the long run, the speech—

Referring to the President's address—has merely increased the difficulties and deepened the disagreements between the East and the West, which are shaking the postwar world.

From many parts of the world come the rising murmurs that it is the expression of a new and expanding American imperialism, while a French newspaper adds that the President's—

concern is not for democracy but for the interest of American big businessmen who are in full action in the Near East.

Mr. President, I have before me a publication entitled "The Value Line—Investment Survey"; it is further entitled "Fortnightly Commentary." It states itself to be published in New York, and purports to be an expression of the business point of view. I read the first paragraph—"Intervention in Greece" is the heading:

After this letter goes to press, President Truman will address Congress on the subject of American intervention in Greece. We are of the opinion that even if the United States should establish an anti-Communist regime on the Greek flank of the Dardanelles, Russia would not immediately go to war. But American commitments in Greece, if they are to achieve their purpose, would have to be followed by commitments in other parts of the world, and such extensive undertaking would weaken capitalism in the American sphere. In so doing they would prove to be self-defeating.

I shall read another paragraph in this periodical. The heading is "The Shift of British Power":

The No. 1 fact of life to hold onto in this maelstrom of postwar political readjustments is that the British are shifting their empire. They are moving out of Asia and east Europe to consolidate in Africa and the Near East. Their great adventure is the chance of developing an Arab world and exploiting Africa. From a speculative standpoint, it seems to be good strategy. Britain has neither the economic sinews nor the fire power to hold India and the Far East or to defend Australia and New Zealand. Her land-based planes probably could hold Africa. There she could obtain raw materials produced with cheap labor, to be processed in England for export at a profit to Britain. By agreement with either the United States or Russia she might be able to share the rich oil fields of the Near East, whence would come the oil to power the air force and fleet that would defend the African empire. The Arabs offer a brilliant opportunity, for they are a people of great ability and no organization. Their political life is a jigsaw of feudal rivalries. Their economy is totally undeveloped.

The letter goes on to infer, Mr. President, that Britain is constantly changing and shifting the point of her emphasis geographically in that remote part of the world.

I read another paragraph:

How then will the Russians react if the United States should formulate a foreign policy that has as its obvious purpose control of the flanks on Russia's only warm-water outlet? Imagine, for a moment, that the United States of America were a landlocked Nation without Atlantic or Pacific sea-ports and that our only outlet to the Atlantic was through the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. Imagine then that Russia, disapproving the Aleman regime in Mexico, decided to intervene with arms and money to unhorse Mr. Aleman and substitute a regime sympathetic to and in close collaboration with one of the totalitarian governments, let us say the Argentinian. Even without the Monroe Doctrine, America would spring to arms.

I read another paragraph:

The upshot cannot be favorable to the United States. The Russians will be resentful and even more suspicious than in the past. They will close ranks at home, more willingly suffering a low standard of living in order to build up their industrial potential for defense. They will look at Britain as an ally, even as a partner in the development of oil fields in the Near East, and to the exclusion of the United States.

And the last quotation from this publication:

The danger to Americans is not the activity of Communist agents but the deterioration of capitalism itself. Sensing our own weakness we look for a foreign devil to blame it on. But this is self-deception. Communism would have no chance at all in a world, or even in a part of a world, in which capitalism was working. Rome did not fall because of the power of the barbarians, but because of the weakness of the Romans. In weakening capitalism in order to "contain" Russia by naked military force, we do not defend ourselves intelligently.

And one other quotation. The publication from which I am reading now is the U. D. A. London Letter, published by the Union for Democratic Action Educational Fund, Inc., in London. This let-

ter makes commentary upon what has been happening in England under the British Government.

Unlike Britons, Americans never really believed that labor meant what it said about breaking with the old English imperial traditions. Hence, when successive steps were taken toward India's freedom, they always flattered themselves that they could detect in each decision some subtle English trick; some new way of holding India against her will. As labor, with gathering speed, disengaged itself of empire (the setting of a near date for Indian independence followed hard on the agreement for Burma's freedom) they found it increasingly difficult to discover equivocations. The coal crisis gave them an excuse for seeing necessity, not design, in Britain's actions; a foolish notion, because far weaker countries (France and Holland) were hanging on to their empires for dear life. The proposal of President Truman to assume responsibility for Turkey and Greece took them utterly by surprise; almost, as it were, between the words "British" and "imperialism." The burden America thus proposed to take up was one of the most unpopular—

Speaking of the British occupation of Greece—

Britain had ever carried. English troops entered Greece to keep it from falling into the Russian sphere. In so doing, they arrested in mid-course a Communist-led revolution. Britain did her best to support what moderate elements existed, but without success; only the Royalists and the Communists were strong in the countryside, and whatever cabinets were put together at the top, the actual administration of the law fell (if Communists were excluded) into Royalist hands. The memory of communistic excesses, and fear of the Slav bloc with its extravagant claims on Greek territory, drove many sincere Republicans to vote for the return of King George. As Britain gradually relaxed her influence, and the Royalists gradually got a freer hand, they in turn proceeded by their harshness and incompetence to turn Republicans into Communists.

I hope that will not be accomplished in the United States.

The British decision to withdraw altogether was logical and expected. As America moved hastily into action, Britain enjoyed the luxury of a sideline seat.

Mr. President, surely a doctrine subject to so many different interpretations—and I am giving them to the Senate only for what they are worth—which has aroused such sincere concerns and fears from noncommunistic sources in so many parts of the world, which has illimitable and incalculable implications, as admitted by its own proponents, should not be adopted without the American people taking ample time to debate and to weigh the solemn judgment they shall cast upon it.

The Congress and the country debated lend-lease, another momentous American policy which had my hearty support, for many months before we enacted it. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee conducted hearings before it recommended it. Those of us who are deeply disturbed by this momentous proposal now before us protest against the effort to secure its hasty passage by the Senate without adequate opportunity for debate in the Senate and in the country.

Especially is it regrettable that the Senate, where the privilege of debate can be unlimited according to the rules, has chosen to act first upon this measure instead of following the practice we used in connection with lend-lease and letting the measure first pass the House and then come to the Senate after the Nation has been more fully advised of its significance and implications.

Let me hasten to assert that in these observations in no sense of the word do I cast any disparagement upon or direct any criticism to the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. VANDENBERG] or to the distinguished members of that committee. On the contrary, the chairman has been characteristically distinguished in the fairness with which he has approached every aspect of this question. He has already told the Senate that the committee heard every witness who asked to be heard. Yet it is a fact—and I am sure it was a necessity on the part of the committee—that in many cases the witnesses were limited in the time they were allowed before the committee. I feel that, if the hearings are considered by the committee to have been adequate, surely here in the Senate, Senators should search their souls and minds upon this momentous proposal and give the American people an opportunity to express their sentiments to their Congress before we launch America upon a course, the implications of which no honest man can foretell.

From church people, from those whose faith in the future is pinned to the United Nations, from those who both love America and love peace, there is a rising tide of opposition to this measure as it is now before the Senate, in spite of the generous gesture which the Foreign Relations Committee, in the utmost of good faith, has extended to the United Nations. I believe Senators will have to go no further than their own mail to affirm the growing opposition to the proposal, the end of which no one can honestly foretell.

Robbed of the military aspects, this measure would have had no opposition in Congress, for we all favor Greek relief to the utmost. In 1945 I had the privilege of spending a few days in Athens. I saw the horror which those people had experienced as the Germans sought to wreak their vengeance upon them for knocking out of order Hitler's timetable to invade the Soviet Union. I heard this at Nuremberg in 1945 from the mouth of General von Brauchitsch, who had been commander in chief of the German Army. The timetable called for an attack upon Russia by the Germans on the 8th of May 1941. Then they determined to occupy Greece and Yugoslavia. Hitler gave the order to General von Brauchitsch for execution. He occupied those two countries. But Von Brauchitsch was a good enough general and an able enough commander to anticipate the difficulty of this assignment. Perhaps he sensed ahead of time the glorious and heroic defense which would be made by the peoples of Greece and Yugoslavia. He called upon Hitler, he said, to allow him to withhold the attack upon Russia until the job in Greece and Yugoslavia was completed.

He testified that Hitler finally acquiesced. The result was that the Nazi assault upon Soviet territory was launched on the 22d of June 1941, instead of on the 8th of May. Because the Germans were aware of what the Greeks had done to upset their timetable, they wreaked every barbaric form of vengeance that they could possibly conceive upon the Greek people. I know, therefore, how dire is their distress and how great is their need.

Relief for Greece could have been continued through UNRRA, which was set up by the United Nations organization, and to which we generously contributed. But the Government of the United States is responsible for the termination of UNRRA, giving some justification for asserting that, in the dispensation of relief, we were not thinking solely about human need and the suffering of men, women, and children, but those who obtained relief had to be politically acceptable to our dispensation. Relief could have been provided through an international relief fund set up in the United Nations, as other nations wished to do, upon the recommendation last year of former Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, the head of UNRRA, pursuant to the directive of UNRRA itself in the United Nations.

But, Mr. President, United States representatives prevented that resolution setting up an international relief fund from being adopted, though Mayor LaGuardia asserts that he had visited Stalin beforehand and that the head of the Soviet Government had given his commitment that the Soviet Union would participate in setting up such an international relief fund.

I hold in my hand the resolutions and official documents showing who proposed to set up an international relief fund and who killed it. This material comes to me, upon my request, from the United Nations organization itself.

We are already undertaking to provide \$50,000,000 outside this bill for immediate relief to Greece, and that is all that is asked to relieve distress in Greece. It will be recognized that I refer to the general relief bill providing \$350,000,000 for relief of other distressed nations and peoples of the world. But again, Mr. President, while that bill allows \$50,000,000 for Greece, there is some justification for the assertion that we recognize human misery and need only when it happens to occur in a country whose political policy is agreeable to the State Department of the United States.

When the Good Samaritan was on the way to Jericho and heard a cry to his conscience, he did not ask whether the recipient of his charity was on his political side. It is a good lesson for America to recall today, like other Biblical illustrations, in the dispensation of Christian charity.

The \$150,000,000 which this measure requests for economic rehabilitation in Greece should be and can be provided through the World Bank in the form of a loan, a part of which, at least, could be paid back, and would not in the first instance be an outright gift, provided at the expense of the American taxpayers.

It is well known that the International Food and Agricultural Organization set up under the United Nations organization sent a mission to Greece to make a study of short-term and long-term needs in that war-torn country. That mission submitted a report, which was recently published. In its report, it asked for two kinds of relief—perhaps I should say three kinds: First, they appealed to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and to the United States and Britain, to provide Greece with short-term relief in the matter of food and other imports which they were not otherwise able to get to cover the period following UNRRA's withdrawal until international assistance and an expanding economy would no longer require such special aid. I understood that type of aid referred to the kind of relief contemplated in the \$50,000,000 appropriation which is being made available by Congress for assistance to the distressed Greek people, outside the proposal which is now before us. But, the burden of the recommendation of that mission of the Food and Agricultural Organization was that the World Bank make a loan of \$100,000,000 to Greece for long-term rehabilitation of her economy.

It is said that the World Bank cannot give this assistance, that it cannot extend this loan. No one denies that it has many billions of dollars in its treasury. One reason it is not able immediately to give this assistance is because there has been some delay on the part of our Government in recommending some of the officials of the institution. It is said it is a lending organization. Several weeks ago the bank announced that the Greek Government had notified it that it intended to apply for a loan and would do so as soon as it completed a study of its needs and its reconstruction program. Surely the Greeks could pay something back. The United States is the major stockholder in the World Bank. If the bank should lose the fund, we would lose the major part. But is not that preferable to giving it all without any hope of reimbursement to the American taxpayers?

So I say, Mr. President, that the relief needs of Greece, short term and long term, could have been taken care of through UNRRA had we continued it. They could have been provided for in an international relief fund had we not killed it. They could be aided now in connection with the \$50,000,000 which Congress is in the course of providing. The long-term relief can and should be provided through the World Bank set up for the express purpose of giving such assistance to those who require it.

Even if the President had asked the Congress to make a direct grant of money to Greece for both relief and rehabilitation, he could have got the money by a simple request. Congress is not going to deny a request of the President that we do our duty in an economic way to the other peoples of the world. But—

What has deeply moved and disturbed the American people and people all over the world is the unprecedented proposal, first, that we send a military mission to Turkey; second, that we give Turkey



\$100,000,000 for the equipment and support of her army for the next 15 months; third, that we send a military mission to Greece; fourth, that we give Greece \$150,000,000 to equip, train, and support a Greek Army of 125,000 for the next 15 months.

I know we are moving in a fast world. I know especially that the international scene is kaleidoscopic in its changes; but I will say candidly, Mr. President, that, if 6 weeks ago anyone had suggested to me that the President would propose or that the American Congress would countenance our sending a military mission to Turkey, paying the major part of the support for the equipment and maintenance of a Turkish Army, I would have thought that the suggestion was unthinkable. It is so linked with the animosity that is directed against some nations and some peoples, it is so delicately interwoven with a nation like Greece for which we have such supreme respect and affection, that we seem to take it as a matter of course that today there are no geographic limits to where America may go in giving aid and armed support for things which we approve of in various parts of the world.

There is an axiom in the law that what we do by another we do ourselves. If we finance another nation's army by providing money for its support, by giving them the equipment, by providing training in the use of the equipment, through the medium of an American military mission, can it be denied that to a very practical degree the foreign army becomes our army because we are financing it, we are equipping it, we are training it, and we are providing supervision in certain ways through an American mission? Above all, we are helping to continue its existence.

What deeply frightens the American people is that, if Congress adopts this measure, it will make the United States, the principal founder of the United Nations, repudiate its solemn covenant to act through the United Nations for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

I have before me the Charter of the United Nations organization. I merely want to read article 1 of that Charter:

The purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. President, the effect of this proposal, if enacted, is officially to brand the United Nations as a failure, and of no force or power to achieve the sacred functions for which it was founded—the protection of the security of peoples and the preservation of the peace of the

world. This proposal has disappointed the hopes of the American people for peace more than any other single event since the establishment of the United Nations.

Mr. President, let me summarize the results from the last Gallup poll on that subject. The poll indicated that 56 percent of the people queried favored the bill asking for \$250,000,000 to give aid to Greece, but the poll report also indicated that a majority of the people regretted that we had not gone, in the first instance, through the United Nations organization, and the poll further disclosed that an overwhelming majority opposed our sending military missions to Turkey and to Greece.

Mr. President, the question of sending military missions might be adverted to at this point. At the present time there is no statute which authorizes the President of the United States to send a military mission to any country outside the Western Hemisphere. There was a statute, enacted several years ago, which permitted us to send military missions within the Western Hemisphere, but not outside it. On the contrary, the fact that the Executive recognizes that he has no authority to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere is best attested by the fact that there is now pending in the present Congress a bill to authorize the President to do that very thing—to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere.

I recall that in 1945 I was visiting in Syria and was talking to the highest officials of the Syrian Government. To the American minister whom I accompanied in the conference and to me—with the idea that in some way I might be able to help in the accomplishment of their recommendations—they pleaded that two American officers in American uniforms be permitted to go there, to help them achieve their emancipation—from the Russians, Mr. President? No; from the British troops. But our officials had to report to them that our Government had no authority to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere, even though they sympathized with their aspirations. Help later was given. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had a very great and excellent influence in the United Nations in bringing about a decision by which British and French troops did leave Syria and Lebanon.

But I am saying that this bill proposes a new principle; namely, to allow military missions to be sent outside the Western Hemisphere. Where will that course lead us?

We are told that not more than 30 or 40 American officers will be sent. Mayor LaGuardia has said that that will mean the sending of 300 or 400 personnel, because every officer will have at least 10 aides. But, Mr. President, if an American officer in the uniform of the United States Army or Navy is placed there, America will be there, with all that that means and with all that it should mean. In many instances it will mean that the American uniform will be the leverage by which reactionary and perhaps corrupt governments may at least psychologically

intimidate the opposition to their own domestic policies.

Mr. President, it is not true that the United Nations is incapable of meeting the present problems of the eastern Mediterranean unless the United States makes it so.

If we rob the United Nations of the stalwart support of the strongest nation in the world and then condemn it as being incapable of acting, the fault is upon us, not the United Nations. We shall have to bear upon our hearts and consciences the immeasurable consequences, not only of this new doctrine which now is proposed, but the mortal blow that we strike at the United Nations, which is our one great gain from all the blood and treasure the war has just cost us.

The leaders who have proposed this measure to us, however earnest and sincere and patriotic, I fear are not aware of what they have done. In an honest but misguided zeal to strike out against what they call communism, as one does against horrible shapes and forms which accost one in a nightmare, they would sabotage the United Nations, destroy any hope of reconciliation with Russia, launch the United States upon an unprecedented policy of intervention in remote nations and areas of the world unilaterally, ally us with the reactionary and corrupt regimes of the world, subject this Nation to the serious accusation of aspiring to become the new Rome or the old Britain, and risk for the American people a war which may destroy civilization.

Against such a policy, small wonder that the protests of those groups who believe in peace and the United Nations, those who want America to hold firm to its old democratic traditions, are rising to a higher and higher pitch.

Surely the Senate will not adopt in haste this policy, the end of which no Senator can foresee.

Mr. President, let me digress here to observe that, as I said to the Foreign Relations Committee the other day, a committee characteristically courteous in their reception, I supported lend-lease. I saw Senators on this floor search their souls for the right decision on that policy. They saw its implications and where it might lead. So did I. But I supported it. I thought that at that time, under those circumstances, there was nothing else to do. But, Mr. President, to those who too rashly condemn some of us who were so hardy in our support of lend-lease and are so reluctant in any support of this measure, let me remind them of the action I took about the 20th of May, 1940, when I stood on this floor and announced to the Senate that the Germans had reached Abbeville, nearly on the Atlantic coast of France; and that they were about to pinch off the whole British Army and that Dunkerque was in prospect. I did not announce that, but that was what was inevitable. Then I announced the purport of a resolution I contemplated submitting, not upon the direction of President Roosevelt, but at least having communicated it to him and having advised him that I would submit it on my own responsibility at noon that day

unless he requested me not to. I read it over the telephone to Miss Margaret Le Hand, his personal secretary. After I had finished she probably disclosed what may have been the thinking of the President, when she said, "It would be great if we could get that, wouldn't it?"

We authorized the President to let any allies who were the victims of Hitler's aggression have any airplanes in our own possession that could be replaced by manufacture in the United States. A little later the authority was extended until it embodied the spirit and the purpose, if not the letter, of the eventual lend-lease law.

What I wanted to emphasize, Mr. President, was that on that day Denmark was under the cruel heel of the Hitler hordes, as was Norway, likewise Holland, likewise Belgium, likewise all eastern France, and it was inevitable that the German Army should sweep over probably all of France. It was thought by a great many at that time that it was only a question of time until Britain herself would fall.

I will say, therefore, that, whenever Russia undertakes, even in a small way, to do the same thing, I shall try to be as diligent in rejection of such action on her part as I was at that time in resisting the actual military aggression of Hitler's hordes upon the people of western Europe.

Let me remind the Senate that there was no United Nations in 1940. Today no military assault has been hurled, and to my knowledge, no ultimatum prophecies such an assault in the immediate future. Today we have taken a solemn covenant that we will collectively keep the peace of the world through the United Nations organization.

I say, Mr. President, against a policy such as that now proposed, small wonder that the protests of the groups who believe in peace and in the United Nations, those who want America to hold firm to its old democratic tradition, are rising to a higher and higher pitch. Surely the Senate will not adopt in haste this policy, the end of which no Senator can foresee.

Let Senators who give their unreserved approval to the pending measure be prepared for the full implications of it, as those of us who supported lend-lease were prepared to accept the utmost implications of that measure.

The American people believe in the United Nations for they know it is the only rock upon which they can base their hopes of any peace. A majority of the people have recently attested their grievous disappointment that the United Nations was bypassed, and their overwhelming opposition to our sending military missions, without precedent, to Turkey and Greece. Now the Foreign Relations Committee, in an attempt to assuage the grief and to satisfy the protest of the American people, ingenuously, and with the best motives—and undoubtedly the committee wishes the matter had been handled differently from the beginning—proposes that the United States go ahead sending military missions to Turkey and Greece, supporting Turkish and Greek armies, and for

all practical purposes administering the Government of Greece, but that it be subject to the veto of the United Nations by a majority vote.

Mr. President, this may soothe our consciences, but it does not correct our conduct. There is no substitute for the United Nations; there is nothing just as good. It is like going through the courts of law—you either do or you do not. You either act according to law or you act outside the law. This proposal, despite the Committee amendment, is still outside the charter of the fundamental law of the United Nations.

It does not discharge our solemn obligation to act through the UN "for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression" and for the "adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace" by acting unilaterally and then telling the UN we will stop if a majority of the UN ask us to discontinue what we are doing.

We solemnly agreed to article 24 of the UN Charter, subparagraph 1 of which provides "in order to insure prompt and effective action"—mind you "prompt and effective action"—"by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

Mr. President, that is what we agreed to. I wish to read that again. Paragraph 1 of article 24 of the UN Charter reads:

1. In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

We solemnly agreed to article 25 of the Charter, which provides "the members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

We solemnly agreed to article 39 of the United Nations Charter providing that "the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations and decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain and restore international peace and security."

We agreed to article 33 of the United Nations Charter, which reads as follows:

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Mr. President, have we exhausted every effort in a peaceful way to settle this dispute as between those who are parties to it, or, if we do not regard our-

selves as a principal party, have we done everything we could by arbitration, conciliation, negotiation, and all the other methods provided in article 33, to bring about a peaceful settlement? If we have not, we have not, in my humble opinion, fully discharged either the obligation or the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

By chapter 6 of the United Nations Charter, if, as is charged, Russia is the real threat to the security of Greece and Turkey and those two nations so charge in the United Nations organization, that organization has the express authority and power, which Russia could not veto, to make recommendations for the peaceful settlement of the dispute or the situation that endangers the maintenance of international peace and security.

I cannot make it too clear, Mr. President, that the Security Council can make recommendations for peaceful settlement respecting any matter, and a party to the dispute cannot vote upon the action of the Security Council. So that, as was brought out in the Committee on Foreign Relations, if Russia is charged by Greece or Turkey, or by any other nation, with being a party to this dispute, she cannot vote in regard to the action of the Security Council in an effort to find a peaceful adjustment of the dispute or the situation which is likely to engender the dispute.

What is the occasion of our alarm respecting the security of Greece? It is that Albania and Yugoslavia and Bulgaria are alleged to have given training, encouragement, and some equipment to certain Greeks alleged to be led by Communists in the northern part of Greece, said to number 13,000. So far as I am aware, nobody has charged that these "armed bands," so-called, consist of anything but Greeks in Greece. But Greece appealed to the United Nations against this aggression. The United Nations took jurisdiction, quite properly, and appointed a Commission of Inquiry. The Commission has been on the spot, made its findings, and is now preparing to report. Can anyone with justice say that the United Nations has failed in this matter? Shall we, before the report of the Commission has been filed, before the United Nations has had a chance officially to know the facts and to take any action, presume that it will not act at all? Can anyone justify the United States in unilaterally sending a military mission to Greece, equipping and training a Greek army of 125,000 as an answer to an alleged intervention now being investigated by the United Nations? On the allegation of small-scale intervention in Greece, I am afraid, Mr. President, we in Congress are being asked to authorize the unprecedentedly large-scale intervention by the United States.

And what is the aggression, or what is the situation threatening the independence and the security of Turkey? There have been no excursions into Turkish territory by the forces of Russia or any other nation. There is no Communist threat in Turkey. The totalitarian government there has seen to that. The assumed threat in Turkey is that certain requests have been made by the Soviet Union to Turkey that the four



Black Sea powers—Turkey, the Soviet Union, Rumania, and Bulgaria—without the western powers having anything to do with it, shall determine the control of the Dardanelles. For over 200 years Russia, feeling that the Dardanelles is essential to its security as well as to its welfare in affording access to the Mediterranean, has either been trying to acquire or to obtain a dominating influence in the control of the Dardanelles. That may be bad policy, but it is not Communist policy—it has been Russian policy for over two centuries. It will be recalled that Russia won the Dardanelles in 1854 in a war with Turkey, and the British and the French then sent their fleets into the Black Sea, sank the Russian Fleet, and forced the Russians to agree to a new treaty taking away from them the Dardanelles, which they had secured by their victory over Turkey and through their treaty of peace with Turkey.

In World War I the Allies solemnly agreed to give Russia the Dardanelles in compensation for Russia entering the war on the Allied side against Germany, while Turkey fought with Germany. And I need not add that Turkey did not fight with us in this war at all, so far as I know, although she did declare war technically toward the end of the conflict. Russia got out of World War I before it was over through her revolution, although, said Sir Bernard Pares, the brilliant British historian, she gave two and one-half million killed and two and one-half million wounded to the Allied victory before she got out, and the British historian Pares says she saved Paris twice by what she did in World War I. But Russia did not get the Dardanelles, and it is my information that the revolutionary government did not ask for it.

Since World War I, the Dardanelles have not been controlled exclusively by Turkey; they have been controlled by a convention of powers called the Montreux Convention, and the dominating powers in that convention have been Britain and France. In short, western European powers have used Turkey as a bastion against Russia. The United States was not a party to the Montreux Convention, but it was agreed at Potsdam that Great Britain and the United States support liberalization of the Montreux Convention and that concessions be made to Russia. This is one of the pending issues yet unsettled among the big powers. But there has never been any ultimatum. There has been no new demand to my knowledge. What precipitated the present proposal was not a new threat by Russia, but notice to Turkey by Great Britain that she was no longer able or willing to pay the major part of the expense of maintaining the Turkish Army. That expense we now propose to assume.

Mr. President, I do not presume to pass judgment on what Great Britain does, but I think the British imperial record discloses to fair critics of history that the British have played the game of power politics, having been in power for centuries. In international affairs they do not have the same tradition we have. If they support a revolution to aid British prestige or further British

interests, that is not a strange doctrine to them. If they finance a foreign army to serve their ends, their people and apparently their parliaments do not object to that. If they even influence internal affairs of other peoples, they have precedents, Mr. President, for such policy, which America, thank God, does not have. And it is a peculiar thing that Britain, which has been in Greece for years, has been there, I dare say, more to serve British policies than to save Greece; and if Britain has been in Turkey helping to support the Turkish Army as well as backing up the Turkish position with the British Fleet and with British bases in the eastern Mediterranean, I presume, Mr. President, that Britain has been doing it to serve Britain's national interest. Call it "imperial," they have not objected to that.

The strange thing is that, though we may be activated by different motives—and I know we are—when we do substantially the same thing, yet is there not some justification for suspicion being attached to our own motives of serving similar purposes on the part of the United States?

I say, Mr. President, let the British do what they choose to do; that is their business. But I have the greatest reluctance to have the charge made against my country that, to a phenomenal degree, we are stepping into empty British footprints in the imperial quicksands of the world.

Mr. President, before I get away from the Dardanelles, though I do not have the clipping before me, let me say that I remember reading last year, about September or late August, in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, the integrity of which no Senator would question, an editorial which said that Americans in considering the Dardanelles' problem might well think of it as if a foreign power possessed the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay. How would we feel about that? And how would we feel if we asserted the right of this government and that government to determine the defense and the control of the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, and Britain, France, or Russia said, "No, you are not going to arrive at that settlement unless we have a voice in it."

Mr. President, I live down in that golden part of this country, that blessed part of this earth called Florida. Instead of thinking about the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, as does the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, I think of the Gulf of Mexico. I look at it on the map. I see that Mexico and the United States of America are the powers which border on that great body of water. I see the mighty Mississippi, which opens up the heart of America, emptying its colossal waters into that great gulf. I see, Mr. President, the Straits of Yucatan and the Straits of Florida, which form the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico. Suppose—God forbid—that in an earlier day we had not wisely acquired Florida and made it a part of the United States of America, but having been Spanish in its early settlement it had remained Spanish in association and come to belong to the Republic of Mexico. Suppose, therefore,

the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico was controlled by Mexico, except insofar as it was regulated by a convention which was entered into, we will say, in the old days when the great European powers were the mighty forces of the earth.

Then suppose that, looking backward historically, we saw a great giant—the United States—arising upon this continent, growing stronger and stronger, and suppose, becoming more and more sensitive to our own security, we had said to Mexico, "The mighty Mississippi opens its arteries to the heart of America. We demand, Montreux Convention or no Montreux Convention, Congress of Vienna or no Congress of Vienna, compact of the nations of Europe or no compact of the nations of Europe—we demand that America, as the mightiest Nation on this waterway, the mouth of which is in your control, shall share it with you, if not dominate it with you, to the exclusion of all the powers of the Old World altogether." Would men who proposed that in the American Congress, would those of our military and naval staffs who advocated it, would those of our State Department who urged it, be called warmongers, subject to denunciation around the world as aggressors against Mexico? I can hear Senators making these steel rafters ring with the defense of American policy calculated to secure the heartland and the homeland of America.

Mr. President, I am not saying that in any case the Soviet Union is justified in coming down and attacking the Dardanelles. I think if she were to do so it would raise the supreme test of what the United Nations would do. For my part I would vote to furnish America's share of the forces necessary to resist that kind of an aggression. But so far it is still in the stage of negotiation. It is a request—call it a demand, if you like—made by Russia upon Turkey. We ourselves admitted that the Montreux Convention should be changed. The Russians truly feel—and there is much ground for such feeling—that the Turks, who in the last war gave raw materials to the Germans and aided them, permitted German ships to slip through this waterway which they presume to protect.

Stop to think about Russia's situation. Take a map and study it. It will be seen that a merchant ship today cannot leave any Russian port and go across any sea of this earth without the permission of the British or the American or the British and the American Fleets.

If I may quote it without impropriety, I will say that I was rather amused at a point of view expressed to me by a lady in Great Britain one evening in 1945 at a dinner. She had heard I had been to Russia as well as to some other countries. She said, "Senator, what do you think of these Russians wanting a navy and everything?" That lady was honestly shocked at the suggestion that Russia should even have a navy.

The other day our own Secretary of the Navy was testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee. I was by the great kindness of that committee permitted to ask a few questions. I said, "Mr. Secretary, I have read in the papers from time to time about American naval

craft going into the eastern Mediterranean. Have we a squadron or task force of any sort in the Mediterranean? I was just wondering if we are correctly informed by the press from time to time, which tells us about certain demonstrations made by American naval forces."

The Secretary, with the ability which is characteristic of him immediately replied by making a very patriotic statement: "I said last autumn that it was my feeling that we should accustom ourselves and the world to the sight of the American flag anywhere in the world that it would not be conspicuous where it went—wherever there is a sea."

I said, "So you deem that that is the role of this country to have the naval craft wherever there is a sea?"

He answered, "I think so; yes, sir."

I said, "Do you deny to other powers the same right?"

He indicated that the seas were free and accessible to all nations.

I wondered what those naval forces would do if the Russians decided to put a navy in every ocean and sea of the world—I wondered if that would be considered an act of aggression on their part. Suppose a Russian ship wanted to leave Murmansk, which is icebound for many months of the year, to go through the Atlantic Ocean, the North Sea, either through the English Channel or to the north of Britain. Does anyone think it could do so without the approval of the British Navy?

Suppose a Russian ship desired to leave a Balkan port, for which Peter fought a war, to go out through the Baltic, through the Kattegat and the Skagerrak, the entrance to the North Sea from the Baltic, does anyone think it would be able to do so without the permission of other powers?

Suppose a Russian ship started from the Black Sea, which laves Russia's homeland, to go into the Mediterranean, could it get through the Dardanelles without Turkey's permission?

If a Russian vessel got through the Dardanelles, could it pass the eastern Mediterranean without the permission of the British Fleet established at Cyprus and with access to Greek bases?

I think if Senators will look at a map they will not have serious cause to wonder why it is that the British have always been so interested in Greece. For, if they will examine closely, they will see that it is not so much the adjacent shores but the Greek islands in the eastern Mediterranean that really dominate the Dardanelles and keep ships from coming through from the other side. Suppose, Mr. President, Russian ships came out of the Black Sea and got through the Dardanelles; suppose they got past Cyprus and it was intended that they should go to the Indian Ocean; could they get through the Suez Canal without British permission?

If the ships got through the Suez Canal and down into the Red Sea, could they negotiate the Indian Ocean without British permission?

Suppose the ships decided to go straight west in the Mediterranean, could they get by the British Navy based at Alexandria? Could they pass Malta, a British base? Could they, without

British approval, get through Gibraltar, which, so far as I can read the map, is a part of the Spanish mainland, but has been a British bastion for centuries? If they got into the Atlantic Ocean, how far could they go without the approval of the British or the American Navy? If they started from the other side, at Vladivostok, and came across the Pacific, we know, of course, that it is our country which dominates that ocean.

If the Russians do what Hitler did, I shall try to do against them what I tried to do against Hitler. The Sudetenland had never been a part of Germany in history. Neither had Denmark. Neither had Norway. Neither had Holland. Neither had Belgium. Neither had eastern France, which Hitler had overrun with force of arms and with Nazi barbarity, when I introduced the genesis of lend-lease and later fought for the bill which was introduced by someone in a position of leadership. However, while I will oppose the exertion of Russian armed force in the acquisition of the Dardanelles, what I think my country should do toward recognizing some elemental justice in her claim is another proposition.

I am not unaware of all the epithets I have had to bear, all the contumely I have had to bear, all the bitter denunciations that I have had to experience from certain sources, to the delight of some publications which call themselves fair, but wish to apply one appellation or another.

All I have ever said is what I think is good policy for the United States of America. As a citizen and as a United States Senator I have the right, if not the duty, to express my opinion. I am saying that it is an act of fairness and justice for the United States of America, in determining what a sound policy shall be, to take into consideration the aspirations, aims, and situations of other peoples of the world, their background, their history, their peculiarities, and their interests and fears.

I have been troubled by the fact that America did not always take an independent position in these issues. America did not say to Britain, "We think Russia is entitled to a large part of what she asks in connection with the Dardanelles, and we are going to support her in an international council in the United Nations." That is where the question ought to be settled. Then we should turn to Russia and say, "You have no right to take the Suez or attempt to take it, or to attempt to take the Middle East. The British have certain interests there which are legitimate. The native peoples have certain interests which are entitled to protection. If you assault them, we are your enemy. We will throw the American Fleet, the American Air Force, the atomic bomb, and American men between you and them; and, God giving us the strength, we will stop you to the best of our ability."

It seems to me that our fundamental error has been that we have taken up where Britain, France, and other European powers have been going for centuries, and have identified ourselves with them, rather than looking at these age-old conflicts and issues from a detached

American point of view. I do not see how we can always say logically, and with force, that no one can venture to question our complete supremacy over the Panama Canal; no one can dare to challenge the absolute sovereignty of Britain over Gibraltar or Suez, or other important and strategic areas of the world proximate to their homeland and their interests, and then say to the Russians, "No; you may have dreamed for two centuries of this control. For two centuries you may have fought for it in war and negotiated for it in peace because you consider it essential to your welfare and security. Despite these facts, we are going to line up behind the old western European powers which have always made it their principal policy to keep you out of the Dardanelles, out of the eastern Mediterranean, out of the oil fields, and out of the trade of the Middle East."

That is where America stands. Today we are not only implementing that policy by sending warships and carriers to the Mediterranean to make demonstrations, but we propose to go a step further. We propose to send a military mission in American uniforms, a little farther to the east than we ever did before; and we propose to put up the money to equip and pay a large part of the expense of maintaining the Turkish Army in Turkey.

Mr. President, if I am oversensitive in feeling concern over a proposal so momentous, I am sorry. But the American people want peace. They want to do what is right. They do not want America to become another great imperial power. They do not care to see the imperial eagles of America floating over far-flung possessions all over the world. They would rather save one ignorant country boy than to have the whole world as an empire. They know that world empire is fool's gold. They know that it leads to desolation and eventual death for every nation that has ever followed that path.

Those who sit in high places in other lands like to play this game as one would play chess. They move a piece here, and push a pawn there. They put a knight in a certain position, and a bishop in another. They seem to enjoy the magnificent game of prestige and power.

After executing a beautiful military maneuver, Robert E. Lee, looking upon the battlefield, felt his exultation at his brilliant success subdued by the carnage he beheld. He said, "It is good that war is so terrible. Otherwise we should like it too much."

I hope those in high places will realize that they are not dealing with pawns, knights, bishops, castles, queens, and kings—although a king is involved in this situation. I hope they will realize that the things they are moving are human beings, the men and women, the boys and girls of the United States of America, and that what they are toying with is a fuse that may set off an explosion which will engulf mankind in the utmost of destruction.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator allow me to finish?



It is true that a civil war in Greece, if only a domestic controversy, is outside the scope of the United Nations. It is certainly outside the interest of the United States, which is solemnly committed to a doctrine of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other peoples.

I remind my colleagues that a few years ago it was common practice for our Government to interfere in the affairs of our sister nations. We did not feel too sensitive about it. Sometimes we encouraged a revolution if we thought we would get a strategic gain from it, such as the Panama Canal. If we did not like one regime, but liked another, we would support the one we liked with money, and sometimes with the marines. What did it do for us? I think, by and large, we tried to follow as honest a judgment as we could when we did that sort of thing. For a long time we really thought when we did it that we were carrying out our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine. We actually helped collect debts with the marines, always fearful that, if we did not ourselves do it, foreign nations might come in. At one time we nearly had trouble with Great Britain, which insisted upon the protection of her rights of a commercial character in Venezuela.

But, Mr. President, time passed. We saw we had won the hatred and the fear of nearly all the countries of Central and South America. Then what did we do? We changed our policy. At the Montevideo conference we announced a solemn agreement with all the nations of the Western Hemisphere that there would be no more American intervention. That was the policy of the good neighbor. We agreed not to use the power of recognition as a means of interfering in the politics internal of these countries. That policy won the Latin-American Republics to our side during World War II. Many times, I am sure, we may have had a certain regret for that policy. We saw Peron come into power in Argentina—a man, in my opinion, if I must speak my sentiments, of fascistic tendency, association, and purpose. Yet we have not sent an army or a navy down there, much as in our naturally impulsive way we might like to do it. If we take on Turkey as a partner, how will we explain our Argentine policy in Argentina, which also remained neutral and played with the Nazis?

We have not thrown Franco out of Spain, although documents in our possession have convicted him of collaboration—not merely acquiescence, but direct collaboration with the Axis in a military way. He refueled and supplied German submarines. Our own State Department has told us that, and I read it on the Senate floor. Yet we have not thrown him out. We did not want to intervene. We felt that in the long run it was better, as Shakespeare says, to "bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of."

In this case, are we intervening in Greece? Are we intervening in Turkey? I realize what my able and distinguished friend, for whom I have both great admiration and affection, has said: That there is no precedent in this respect, because we have been letting Britain have money; we have been letting France have

money. But, Mr. President, so far as I know, we have never taken over the job of equipping, financing, and attaching a military mission to the British Army. We have never done that with respect to the French Army. What would our people back home have said to us if it had been believed that we were supporting the French Army that was in Indonesia, shooting down with modern weapons of war the natives who were seeking to lift themselves out of their slavery to emancipation as a new people?

I am not aware, Mr. President, that we have done anything through UNRRA or in these other instances except honestly to lend or give money. If the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will say now that everything will be stricken from the bill except the provision for the money that we propose to give Greece for relief and the money that we propose to give or loan for rehabilitation, I shall sit down and join him in moving the unanimous passage of this measure. No, Mr. President, we do not object to giving relief to Greece. We do not object to lending money to Greece to rehabilitate her war-torn economy.

To be perfectly candid, it has been very embarrassing to me to appear in opposition to this proposal which has been so forthrightly, so sincerely, and so patriotically presented to the Congress by our great President. But what we object to is the principle; and what I am afraid of is that, if we start sending military missions to European countries, if we start equipping, training, and maintaining foreign armies, we shall have taken a step that will hurl us over a precipice and we shall never, in my humble opinion, be able to recover.

Take Greece, for example. The money is to be used to establish an army of 125,000 in Greece.

How many guerrillas are there in Greece? It has been said that there are 13,000 Greek guerrillas. They may have had a few arms; they may have had some training; they may have had some other aid or assistance from Albania or Yugoslavia or Bulgaria, either singly or altogether. But I think that by and large everyone admits that the Greeks are fighting amongst themselves. There are approximately 7,000,000 people in Greece, and there are 13,000 guerrillas, all of them Greeks. There is a United Nations Commission there now preparing its reports based on what it found when it went there for the United Nations. Although the United Nations has not yet received that report, yet suddenly the United States resolves to send a military mission to Greece and to give the Greeks money, arms, and training in order to have an army of 125,000.

Mr. President, the Senate does not need to take my word for it. Read the dispatches which have come from Greece. There have been excesses on both sides. I think that is the truth of the matter. As General Marshall found in China, the extremists on both sides take positions which are contrary to our ideas of what should be done or what people should stand for.

So we are establishing a Greek army of 125,000. For what? To restore order in Greece? To eliminate the guerrillas—

or what our Secretary of War called armed bands or bandits—or whatever we want to call them? I shrank a little when he used the word "bandits." I believe an honest appraisal will reveal that many of the so-called bandits bared their breasts to the Germans and fought for Greece against Germany in the early stages of World War II and were partisans against them during the German occupation. I feel that it is fair to say that most of those people are patriotic, and that, while there may be, and no doubt are, some Communists leading them, some communistic influences encouraging them and directing them, many of those men are quite as honest—I have been told some things about them—as the ragged army that followed George Washington for the freedom and independence of the Thirteen Colonies so long ago.

It troubles me sometimes to wonder whether we have forgotten that at one time we were not free, but were governed by a king, and that there were Americans who would rather die than have to live that way. There may be Greeks who feel the same way.

Mr. President, this is no new experience for the Greeks.

Let me quote from the annual message to Congress of President James Monroe, in which he expounded the Monroe Doctrine:

A strong hope has long been entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest, and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. \* \* \* there is good cause to believe \* \* \* that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.

In that document we agreed not to interfere in the internal affairs of any European power.

Sometimes, perhaps, we are not realistic. After all, the little tea tax which George III imposed on the Colonies was a mere bagatelle. The little stamp tax that the Parliament imposed on the American Colonies—"taxation without representation"—did not amount to a pittance. It was not the amount of the tax that was of importance; it was the principle for which Patrick Henry sounded the tocsin of American sentiment, when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death!" I do not care what anyone says in commentary upon the statement, but I believe that today in the mountains of Greece, awaiting the first shot of the American Army—not in the uniform of America, but facing American equipment, for which America is morally responsible—awaiting the first shot of the first American gun that will throw its shells among them—are those who also waited, one day, for the German shells to explode. They waited the Germans out; and I predict that time will show that they will wait the others out, for there will come a time when the Americans, too, will leave. I do not know how long they will stay.

If I am not mistaken, we are headed toward that course. There is nothing I can do, and, so far as I know, there is nothing that anyone who is raising his voice today, or is troubled in his heart,

can do. In the sheer momentum of our power, we are bound to a destiny that will mean, first, empire, and then, the same disillusionment that has been wrought in the full tide of time upon everyone who has pursued that illusive and delusive snare.

So, Mr. President, all that I am saying is simply for the record, I suppose. I think I would feel better, perhaps, sometime, to be able to say that I was against it, and that I said so and that I said I did not think it was a good policy—not that I have any aspiration of stopping it or very perceptibly slowing it down. The die is cast, Mr. President; we are off. We shall not see the end, unless some great conflagration consumes us all.

But I see mankind locked in a power struggle against which, and beside which, the Peloponnesian Wars and the other struggles of antiquity shall be but the play of children's soldiers. There has never been anything like this before—when, standing on one hemisphere, one giant of the earth extends its sword in mortal combat with another giant of the earth, the master of three continents, to be a battle to the death. The world has never seen that before.

Mr. President, a civil war in Greece, if only a domestic controversy, of course, is outside the scope of American intervention, if we do not depart from our noninterventionist policy of the past.

I started to say that the army in Greece, which we are to finance, will be supposed to get rid of the Greek guerrillas. That will mean shooting them if they do not surrender. Are we going to be there to tell them which ones to shoot? Are we going to distinguish between the Communist and the Republicans? Or are we just going to let those fascistic-minded Royalists take our guns, that we put in their hands, and our ammunition that we put in their guns, and with skill and training acquired from us, directed by our military mission, shoot down anyone they want to shoot down? Is not America going to revolt at that? Unless we are going to deny the freedom of the press and the radio, which I am sure we are not, there will be a picture, some day, of those who were lined up against the wall; and reports will come trickling through that the Royalists are doing with skilled fanaticism what they have been doing ever since they got notice that probably we were going to give them this support—getting rid of their enemies, killing them with our weapons.

Mr. President, does not it seem reasonable that if we give Greece all the economic aid she needs and if we feed them and clothe them and shelter them and help repair their railroads and give them ships and rebuild their docks and wharves, they could at least, if they needed to, take sticks and staves, and thus, 6,987,000 of them could survive and protect themselves in the enjoyment of the kind of government they want, against 13,000, without having our Army over there? Mr. President, people who really want democracy must be ready to fight for it, in the first place; and in the

second place, they must deserve it. We cannot give anyone democracy unless he wants it. People do not deserve it unless they are prepared to fight for it.

If Russia, with her great might, were on the threshold of that heroic little country, threatening her independence with her might and power, then I would say God speed our weapons to arrest their progress and to preserve that little country. But 6,987,000 Greeks, in my opinion, with all the economic aid we can give and with the United Nations behind them, are not ready to succumb to 13,000 who are alleged to be led by Communists in the mountains of Greece.

So, Mr. President, I venture to say that we are doing this more to protect the strategic and economic interest of the United States of America than we are to protect the Government and the people of Greece. We are trying to maintain a power position in the Middle East, vis-à-vis Russia. That is what it is about, really.

Mr. President, if that ever becomes necessary, we shall have to face it. But let us not put it upon the pretense that it is charity that we are extending or that we are trying to save Greece. Let us say nakedly that it is a power struggle with Russia and that we are determined to fight it out wherever the issue is joined.

Mr. President, I wish to state my idea of the best way to handle that matter if we are to come to such an issue. I do not exclude it; it may be necessary. I think it can be avoided, and I pray that it can. I am not very far away from the position of the able Senator from Virginia in saying that this matter should be put squarely in the hands of the United Nations organization and should be settled there, for better or for worse. But, as I have said, if 7,000,000 Greek people have so much as lost their classic love for democracy and their ancient hate of tyranny that they are powerless before these 13,000 in the mountains, and if the matter is such as to threaten the peace, the first and square duty to meet that threat is upon the United Nations, and the first obligation of every member state is to act through the United Nations in its solution. That we have failed to do. No amount of backing up, no amount of collateral jurisdiction that we voluntarily extend, no amount of good will which the Foreign Relations Committee has earnestly and ably intended to exhibit, can conceal the fact that we did not go through the United Nations, and we have not yet gone through the United Nations, and we do not propose to go through the United Nations.

Let me run the risk of being tedious by reading again from chapter I, article 2, of the Charter of the United Nations:

The Organization and its members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles.

It goes on to say that—

2. All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.

Mr. President, what is the obligation that is assumed? I am reading now from article 1:

The purposes of the United Nations are—

Surely every Member subscribes to the purposes of the Organization. I read them:

1. To maintain international peace and security—

Mr. President, would not international peace and security include peace and security in Turkey and Greece?

I read further—

and to that end: to take effective—

Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the next word, for it is the key to this question. The Charter does not say there "effective measures," but it says "effective collective measures." That is what it says—

to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace—

Are not these alleged to be just exactly that—threats to the peace? Are not these alleged to be acts of aggression or other branches of the peace?

I read further—

and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes—

Is not this an international dispute? If it is not, I read further—

or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Can anyone deny that this thing in Greece is a situation, that this case of Turkey is a situation, at least, which might lead to a breach of the peace? We have the words of the President that that is the significance of both of them—aggression against the northern boundary of Greece, the possibility that if Turkey should fall, it would produce disorder in the whole Middle East. Is not that a situation which threatens or is likely to endanger the peace of the world? If it is, have we not solemnly obligated ourselves to act collectively, through the United Nations, in time to solve it, and can we say we have discharged our obligation when we have never even asked the United Nations to take it up, and to work with us in its solution, except in respect to the border commission in Greece which was the result of a request by the Greek government to the United Nations. We were a party to that, that objective is being carried out, but the commission has not had a chance to report. The United Nations has not failed to act, it has not failed. We have not pleaded and then had our pleas scorned. We have not petitioned the United Nations and had our petition denied, as Patrick Henry said the colonists had done before they were forced to act as revolutionaries.

As I said a while ago, Mr. President—and I say it again, with all respect and deference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, every member of which I honor—this attempt on the part of the committee, however honorable and laudable it is, does not cure our conduct. It



may soothe our consciences, it may exemplify the good will the committee has toward the United Nations—and it has unquestioned good will—but it does not change the fact, I have the testimony of the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the President proposed this message to Congress, and for 16 days the United Nations was not even notified, let alone consulted, or made the instrument of collective action, in an effort to solve this threat to the peace of the world.

So, Mr. President, as I said, I honor the committee. It has done the best it could, unless it had gone a little further and just flatly provided that this matter will have to go through the United Nations, and shall not take effect unless the United Nations, after a fair petition on the part of the United States, has refused to act collectively in the matter. The situation would be different if they were to ask us to act, if there had been first a failure on the part of the UN in these cases, and the President came to us and said, "What else can I do?" I put it up to the United Nations. Our representatives sought their assistance. We tried to discharge our obligation, to take effective collective measures to save Greece and to save Turkey. Day in and day out, week in and week out, we pleaded in the Security Council and in the Assembly for the other nations to stand with us to save the situation, and they failed. They have spurned our plea. They have refused. What else can I do but ask you to join me in the solemn responsibility I take when we go it alone in this treacherous field?"

The President has not done that, and we know he has not done it. I do not say that critically. I know the President's motives could not be higher, his patriotism could not possibly be more pure, his intentions could not be more laudable. He is honest and sincere. But this is not the first time that Senators on this floor have had conscientious disagreement, in the matter of policy, with the Chief Executive, and I am not the only one ever to have been in that position in the Senate; and Senators who have taken that position are no less Americans for having an honest difference of opinion.

The Congress is the one which has to take the responsibility. We are now in an embarrassing situation, we are told; but embarrassment is no excuse for failure to discharge a duty. The President, too, has expressed his fidelity to the UN. Perhaps he was pressed by counselors who might have erred.

Mr. President, at least all of us gain by reflection, we gain by counsel and debate, and especially we gain when we let the wise heads and the strong hearts of the American people be heard. Their judgments are fundamentally right, and, as Lincoln said, while not always the wisest, they are in the long run the safest depository of power. The American people have not been so troubled by anything since the end of the war as they are by the bypassing of the United Nations in the making of this decision by the Government of the United States.

Nor, Mr. President, has one the right to assume that there would be a veto by any member in any aspect of the situation before the Security Council. There might be, but I say we have no right officially to act upon the premise that there would be. The United Nations got Russian troops out of Iran without a veto. The moral opinion of the world was mightier than an army, and, let me say, we did not send American troops to Iran, nor did we finance the Iranian army to build it up to throw the Russians out. We turned the scrutiny of moral condemnation upon their violation of their treaty, and they got troops out of little Iran without a veto and without the use of force.

The UN got British troops out of Syria and Lebanon without a veto, and without our giving any money to either one of them to build up a bigger army, nor did we send a military mission to either one.

Mr. President, Senators will remember the old debate we used to have over the proposition that the pen is mightier than the sword. There is nothing on earth as powerful as the moral judgment of mankind. A little while ago it looked as if no force under Heaven could stop the Nazis. In terms of troops and weapons and the materials of war we were doomed. Everything except the heart and the spirit, the will for freedom, of the people of the world, seemed to collapse before them. But resurgent democracies eventually vanquished them. I cite merely for the record that the UN, without more troops than they have now, without more authority than they now possess, got Russian troops out of Iran, and British and French troops out of Lebanon and Syria.

Let us first get all the foreign troops out of Greece. Let me say again that when I have tried here to be condemnatory of one country as against another, I said, as Senators will see if they look up the words I used, we should have the United States lay down a single standard of international morality. Let us get foreign troops out of every nation. We cannot leave British or other foreign troops in some other people's country, and have some of our own there, and then expect to carry conviction in our condemnation of the Russians for doing some of the same things. I repeat, let us get all foreign troops out of every nation, and I will pledge, Mr. President, any possible contribution I can make, in support of that kind of a policy. So I say, before we start to settle the situation in Greece, let us get foreign troops out of Greece, any country's troops out, including our own, and keep them out.

Let us keep out of Greece and out of Turkey, all foreign money to maintain armed forces. Let us honestly, and according to the rules of justice and fairness, seek to settle the issues involved in the present dispute, including the Dardanelles, and in accordance with the Atlantic Charter, and equalize access to the oil resources of the Middle East. Let us then see whether any of the permanent members of the United Nations organization prevent effective action by

the Security Council in the discharge of its obligation to preserve the peace. I shall deal later with what we should do in case they do that.

Mr. President, we all know that the situation with respect to oil in the Middle East is substantially this: Probably the greatest undeveloped oil preserve in the world is in Saudi Arabia. Two American companies, the Texas Co. and the Standard of California, have total concessions in that field. There are two other oil companies, the Standard of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum of New York, which have attempted to buy into this concession.

In southern Iran is one of the great oil preserves of the world, one of the great oil-producing fields of the world, and there the British Government owns nearly 55 percent and thus has control. In Iran, another one of the great oil areas of the world, four principal countries are represented in equal shares—the Netherlands, Great Britain, France, and the United States—and an individual, who I think got the original concession, has a small percentage of ownership. In other areas in that region, Mr. President, the ownership is similar. Now of all that vast area, although Russia occupies the same relation to Iran as we do to Mexico—it is proximate; it borders it—the only concessions the Russians have is in the northern part of Iran, which finally grew out of the dispute the Russians were having with the Iranian Government a little while ago.

Not only that, Mr. President, but Russia once had that concession, and Lenin and his revolutionary government gave it up. At the same time the Russians got their northern concession, the British got a southern concession. They developed theirs; the Russians gave theirs up, but later on undertook to demand it again, I believe, partially at least because of the terrific loss or impairment of their oil production which they sustained by the destruction of the Germans during the war. I have read in Washington newspapers statements issued by American oil authorities, that the Russians were suffering a shortage of oil; that the production cost of oil in their country was high; and that they were seeking outside territory or areas in which they might replenish their own resources.

Mr. President, I merely say that in the Atlantic Charter we spoke about equality of access to the "have-not" nations. I am not saying that we should turn over to the Russians any of our concessions, but I do think that the oil of the world should not be monopolized by any nation or group of nations. It tends to encourage conflict in an effort to obtain what it should be possible to get by working out a sensible arrangement, the way we do in our commercial transactions. Yet today there are people who charge that what in part is really behind this policy and other acts similar to it in the Middle East is the fact that today we are a middle eastern power, due to the concessions that American oil companies have in Saudi Arabia and the interests they have in other areas in the Middle East, rich with oil reserves.

Mr. President, is not that the old way rather than the new way? Is not that the pre-Atlantic Charter way, rather than the post-Atlantic Charter way of working out these things?

Again I ask, are we following in the footsteps of imperial Britain? She embarked upon her imperialistic program in order to protect her lifelines, then justified everything she did on the grounds of necessity. Are we justifying what we are doing upon the grounds of necessity, American pecuniary interest, due to the necessity of our maintaining the oil fields and concessions we have in the Middle East?

Mr. President, is there not some way, besides conflict, by which a question or dispute of that character can be settled honorably to all?

I was saying, Mr. President, the UN, by chapter 7 of its Charter, has authority by the vote of the five permanent members and two others to use economic sanctions or necessary force to maintain or restore international peace and security. If Russia or any other permanent member should prevent the Security Council from determining "the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression" and from making recommendations or deciding "what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42 to maintain or restore international peace and security" under article 39 of the Charter, then, under the interpretation of the Charter recently announced by Senator Austin, our representative in the UN, the other member nations are still obligated under article 1 of the Charter "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression"; nor does such a veto relieve all members of the UN of their duty under article 2 of the Charter to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered."

Nor does such a veto under article 2 relieve all members of their duty to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations."

In other words, instead of our Government telling the world that the United Nations cannot function, our solemn duty is to make it act effectively. It is time for the United States to take the lead in saving the United Nations. Lincoln assumed that his first task was to save the Union. Before Congress had conferred upon him any authority to raise an army, he, as Chief Executive, called for volunteers to save the Union.

This is the supreme challenge to the United States. We must not finish the rending of the United Nations by this blow. We must not lead those who would destroy the United Nations by unilateral action. As the strongest member of the United Nations, we must take the lead in making the United Nations function as it was intended to function. If, Mr. President, the Charter needs revision or modification, it is equally our solemn duty to take the lead

in the project that will accomplish that, as well.

But shall we be so presumptuous as to believe that we are the only member of the United Nations which either believes in peace, or is prepared to resist aggression, or loves democracy, or wants peace?

Do we have such a monopoly of virtue in all that vast organization that not one nation among its members could be found to remain true to its solemn vows to the United Nations?

We know otherwise.

Indeed, as President Truman addressing the final plenary session of the UN Conference in San Francisco said:

You have created a great instrument for peace and security and human progress in the world.

The world must now use it.

If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it.

If we seek to use it selfishly—for the advantage of any one nation or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal.

The successful use of this instrument will require the united will and firm determination of the free peoples who have created it. The job will tax the moral strength and fiber of us all.

How prophetic are those words.

We all have to recognize—no matter how great our strength—that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please. No one nation, no regional group, can or should expect, any special privilege which harms any other nation. If any nation would keep security for itself, it must be ready and willing to share security with all. That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace.

Mind you, Mr. President, the President said that each nation will have to share security with all. He continued:

That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace. Unless we are willing to pay that price, no organization for world peace can accomplish its purpose.

And what a reasonable price that is.

Field Marshal Smuts, the grand old man of collaboration in the world for the past decades, in addressing the final plenary session at San Francisco, speaking of the Charter, said:

It provides for a peace with teeth; for a unified front of peace-loving peoples against future aggressors.

It is for our peace-loving people to see that this peace plan is backed with all their energy, all their heart and soul.

That is what General Smuts said; that is what he said was the obligation of us all. Have we discharged that obligation?

If now, instead of acting through the United Nations, we repudiate it, then we are destroying it the same way that the League of Nations was destroyed. Mr. President, it was the decision of the big nations to act unilaterally outside the League instead of making the League act collectively; for example, against Japan when it invaded Manchuria, and Italy when it invaded Ethiopia, and Germany and Italy when they invaded Spain, which sounded the death of the League of Nations and made World War II merely a matter of what year.

The United States and the Soviet Union not only can but must live in the

same world. There is no other world to which to go and in which to live at all in the human sense.

We not only should but must together work toward the world's peace, security, and prosperity. But each of us has vital interests which the other must recognize. Each has fears which the other must respect. Each has concerns which the other must neither deny nor disparage. Each, in judging the other, must first look at that nation's past, its history, its peculiarities and, above all, what it has suffered and by what dangers it believes itself to be beset.

It cannot better our relations with Russia for the United States in the Dardanelles to take over the role of the old western European powers who made it the cardinal principle of their policy to keep Russia shut up in the Black Sea, out of the Mediterranean and the Middle East—without an ice-free port. If we take over the role of the British, which was admittedly in furtherance of their imperial interests, how can we escape at least the charge of ourselves following an imperial policy?

Is all of the fault on Russia's side that Soviet-American relations today are so bad? Is Russia totally to blame for the wasting of the legacy of good will and confidence which President Roosevelt transmitted as his immeasurable inheritance to his fellow countrymen and to the world? Have those in the world, indeed in America, who hate Russia, who magnify our differences with Russia, who would like to destroy Russia, or those who do not understand Russia, made no contribution to the present enmity and strife which provokes this dangerous doctrine?

Russia is constantly denounced as having been engaged in a protracted course of conquest since the end of the war. Yet, she has today less territory than she had at the beginning of World War I. Mark those words, Mr. President. The Soviet Union today has less territory than she had at the beginning of World War I. Does that look like a protracted course of aggression? And it must be admitted that in reaching out for security, the United States, since the war, has reached thousands of miles farther from its homeland than has the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I am not saying we should not have had the Marianas and the Carolines, which we insist upon as being placed in our exclusive control. I know the blood those islands cost us. But when we reached for them we did not call ourselves aggressors. We thought we were doing something essential to our own security. It may be that Russia has something of the same feeling, rightly or wrongly, about what she does.

Those who know the measure of Russian suffering—that Russia bore the brunt of the war in numbers killed and forces engaged, must know that no nation in the world needs peace as does Russia; that none has more to gain from peace than she.

Any man who loves peace must appreciate the vital necessity of the United States and Russia coming to a successful common recognition of each other's



place and function in the world. I am no less exacting in my demand that they recognize our place and our interest than I am that we recognize theirs. If we work together, we can give mankind the longest peace and the highest level of life it has ever known. But if we, by the enactment of this proposal immeasurably set up and intensify the undeclared war which is going on between the United States and the Soviet Union today, the area of conflict will broaden and broaden and broaden until it shall soon stretch around the world, and all mankind will be forced to take one side or the other in an approaching war, which the Senator from Michigan, himself, has said, "Civilization cannot survive."

Mr. President, let us make this clear. We will not allow Russia directly or indirectly to dominate the world, but if she threatens aggression, the instrument now to check and to hold her or any other aggressor is the United Nations or at least those who shall rally to the standards, like Lincoln's volunteers, of the United Nations.

We are not going to see the world overrun by communism. But the spread of ideas cannot be stopped with guns or bayonets or even atom bombs. Even all the wealth of America is not enough alone to hold off the surging forces of the people, only a small part of whom are Communists, who are reaching out, some of them blindly, some frantically, some in desperation, many misguided, for the rungs of hope upon which to pull themselves from their misery. Only through the United Nations, through the Social and Economic Council and through all the other agencies of the United Nations, through wise leadership and planning and intelligent and sincere cooperation with all of us doing our utmost, can we really establish in the world conditions under which democracy can hope to live.

I cannot half so well state the basic fallacy of this proposal as a battle for democracy, as it was stated in the Washington Post of April 8 by Mr. Walter Lippmann when he said, "What bill?" referring to the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to know what we were going to do, and an inquiry to determine whether we had the resources to accomplish it:

What bill? The immediate bill for Greece alone is nearly \$300,000,000. But under the administration policy this can be only the first installment. The money is to be used to balance the Greek budget this year on behalf of a government which collected almost no taxes and is, with our approval, conducting a civil war. Conceivably this installment would pay the Greek bill if there were set up promptly in Athens a government which can collect taxes and can unite the bulk of the Greek people. But the deficits of this government, which protects the profiteers and is trying to crush the Republicans—

Again I hope that will not be taken too literally in this country. I suspect that there are many Senators on both sides of the aisle who would be shot with some of the shells we propose to send over there, because they were Democrats or Republicans whom the royalist, fascist-minded government in some respects, did not like. This is not my word. This is

the word of Mr. Walter Lippmann, a competent observer. I continue:

But the deficits of this Government, which protects the profiteers and is trying to crush the Republicans as well as the Communists, will continue as long as the Government, as now constituted and conducted, exists.

Yet Greece is only a pinpoint in the Truman global policy. There can be no end to the financial costs of that policy because adequate precautions have not been taken to see to it that the money will accomplish the purposes for which it is given. Unless the Greek Government is reformed, Greece will not be stabilized by our meeting the deficits of that government.

The case of Greece illustrates concretely the basic fallacy of the Truman doctrine in its present uncorrected, unqualified and unbalanced form. It is that the expansion of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism can be checked by subsidizing all the governments, parties, factions, which are most undeniably anti-Communist. A policy of this kind is bound to fail because it commits us to an alliance with the most reactionary forces in the world and alienates the moderate and democratic forces.

It assumes that mankind is divided into totalitarian Communists and Jeffersonian Democrats. It is not. There are also Nazis, Fascists, feudal lords, war lords. There are also Republicans, enlightened conservatives, liberals, progressives, social Democrats, Socialists, Christian Democrats, cooperators, labor parties, democratic planners, and what-not.

If we conduct the Truman policy on the principle that whoever is most vehemently against the Soviets is our friend and ally—and in his heart a Jeffersonian Democrat—we shall separate ourselves from the masses of the people almost everywhere. We shall have embraced the extremists of the right as against the extremists of the left, when it is our interest and our duty to align ourselves with the middle and the moderate parties.

I interpolate that that is what General Marshall recommended for us in China. That is what we are not doing in Greece or Turkey.

I continue to read from the editorial:

They are our real friends in the struggle for freedom, and they will decide the issue.

Rich as we are, and powerful as we are capable of being, we are not rich enough to subsidize reaction all over the world or strong enough to maintain it in power. The American people and the Truman administration do not want to do that, of course, nor do they think they are doing it. But that is what we shall be doing, nevertheless, if we entrust the formulation and execution of the new policy to men whose zeal has gotten the better of their judgment.

Let America remember, as we make this solemn decision, that we cannot, with arms, cram democracy down people's throats. They must want it and be willing to fight for it, either to be able to gain it or to deserve it.

Today our great country stands at the Rubicon. Flushed with our victories with our loyal legions clamoring to follow us, we can, like Caesar, not only take Rome, but begin what some historians have called, the glorious journey down the glamorous path of empire. No nation started out to be a great empire, but those who came to the purple and the ermine took decision after decision, never going at once the whole way, until eventually there was no turning back, short of their tragic dissolution. Is

there anything about any empire of the past that America desires to emulate? Could anybody seriously suggest that we should follow that fool's gold or that our quest would end differently from that of all others who have pursued it? Yet this proposal so hastily urged upon us would clearly set us on the path of empire.

Can the world's greatest empire, now our contemporary, teach us nothing? Have we not the good sense and the good spirit to curb our own power and to make it humble, to make America come as humbly to world leadership, in the Council of Nations, as Thomas Jefferson came riding on his horse to his inaugural?

The implications of this measure reach beyond the prediction of any man. Senators declaring their support of it with honest candor have said it might mean war. Is this issue one upon which we can hazard that event?

Does the pending issue in the Dardanelles demand that we challenge in mortal combat a nation occupying one-sixth of the earth and containing one-tenth of the world's people? Is Russian access to the eastern Mediterranean such a violent invasion of our rights and interest that it demands we risk war? Are we prepared to thicken the sands of the Middle East with American blood as the price of our exclusive enjoyment of the oil resources of that area?

America's role is to lead the world to peace, not war; to help mankind up, not to push it down; to build, and not to destroy. If there be those who will not hearken to the appeal of right or respect the sentiments of justice, if there be those who would trample upon their fellow men as aggressors, we shall not be slow to defend the cause of the oppressed. But we have not been singled out alone to stand in the Thermopylae of right against the invading hosts of wrong. We have solemnly pledged that we will work—and, if needs be, fight—with the other members of the United Nations against war makers if all possible methods of peaceful adjustment have failed. That is the kind of team ball to which we have already committed ourselves. That is truly befitting the American character. That is in the American tradition. There, in the United Nations, is America's rendezvous with destiny.

It has been said that our refusal to adopt this measure would repudiate our President. The world knows that we do not differ here in this debate about objectives; it is essentially about methods that we argue. We have in the Congress the sacred duty to determine the best way to preserve the Nation's peace and security, the peace and security of all peoples. We do not have the fearful alternative of rejecting the President or repudiating the United Nations, for the President, too, is wedded to the United Nations. Congress has the power—yes, the challenging opportunity—to make the United Nations able to function as it was intended to function. We can give it the strength it is alleged to lack. We can supply the very force which it is alleged not to have. With the unstinted support of this Congress, the United Nations can realize its full vigor and

promise. It can become, as it was intended to be, the last best hope of peace on earth. The question is, Shall Congress destroy the United Nations, or shall it build it?

I proclaim that there is nothing that this Congress could do in its whole life which would so hearten mankind as to rededicate this country to the United Nations and to its high purpose to maintain international peace and security. The world would know that when required to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression in the name of this noble charter, we have again pledged our lives, our fortunes and our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor; that America is, and before God and man will continue to be, a Democracy dedicated to the people, the servant of their hopes and their dreams, the friend of all the peoples who live in the houses, big and little, beside the roads of the world; that no overweening ambition, no lure of profit or power, no fool's gold of empire shall tempt us to betray our dead or our destiny; that America is not soft, that it is not afraid to fight either for the poor, the oppressed, or the victims of aggression, that we realize that we can neither lift up mankind nor protect their security, strong as we are, alone; and that therefore we shall keep our pledge to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; that we turn our faces toward the future with confidence; that we are on God's side because we are on man's side, and as our cause is just we are strong in His strength. If, God forbid, we shall ever have to fight, let us fight to save the Union, as did Lincoln, because the Union is all that can save men. As Washington said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the just may repair." And now, as it was when Washington rose to defend the new Charter of the United States, "The event is in the hands of God."

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Standing Committee, the senior Senator from South Dakota, be excused from all sessions of the Senate the remainder of the afternoon and the week. He is on official duty in connection with the work of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FLANNAGAN, and Mr. COOLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.);

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 10, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.);

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

#### AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 1, after the word "act", to strike out the comma and the words "and any necessary expenses related thereto."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today on the general question of the proposal which is now before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not wish to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator would like to have an audience.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I know that Senators have a great deal to do. If they are not here it will be their misfortune.

I am approaching this question, which has many phases, by addressing amendments to it. I have five or six such amendments, and it is my plan to speak on them as they are called up; and in that way I shall be able to touch on all the vulnerable points which are encompassed in this extremely important question which the Senate must decide.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator propose any amendment this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall talk about an amendment. That is the reason I did not want to discuss the general subject this afternoon. This is not the time to bring up amendments, but we have run out of speakers for today. Several speakers will be ready tomorrow. I think perhaps it would be better that I talk about one of my amendments today. I shall not call it up, but shall talk about it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was going to take the liberty of suggesting that there are only two or three committee amendments which I am sure everyone, whether in favor of or opposed to the bill, agrees should be in the bill, and that we might immediately adopt those amendments and let the Senator then offer one of his amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to have that done. I shall not offer any particular objections to the committee amendments. I do not think they go far enough. I am not satisfied with them, but I am not opposing them.

I think, however, perhaps it would be just as well for me to go ahead with my discussion of one of my amendments—not calling it up at the present time, but discussing it, nevertheless, and calling it up at a later time.

Mr. President, the amendment about which I shall talk today is one which I have submitted. It has for its purpose the exclusion of Turkey from receiving any assistance under Senate bill 938. If my amendment is adopted to Senate bill 938, under the bill, as thus amended, Turkey would not receive any loan or gift or money from the United States.

This amendment is the most important amendment, in my estimation, which I shall have to offer because there is no part of this entire matter that is as fundamental as is our proposal to give money and aid and military assistance to the Republic of Turkey. To my mind, that is the most important feature of this bill; it is the heart and soul of it.

Although I may be mistaken, I believe that the references to Greece are simply thrown in as a sort of camouflage or as a sweetening for the bitter pill, an attempt to throw dust in our eyes, an attempt to drag a red herring across the trail, so that we shall not see what the real issue is. The real issue, as I have said, is aid to Turkey; and implied in the aid to Turkey, I find a military al-



liance between the United States and Turkey. That is not spelled out in the bill; it has not been entered into and agreed to by the Congress of the United States. Nevertheless, a military alliance is implied, just as certain as that we are sitting here today discussing this question. A military alliance is implied in the measure. We cannot give military assistance to another nation without having a military alliance some place in the background. That is the situation we are facing today in this whole great question.

So the particular amendment I shall discuss today in my opinion is the important one—namely, the amendment providing for the exclusion of Turkey from receiving any assistance under Senate bill 938.

I noticed the other day that the newspapers carried great headlines and lengthy articles to the effect that Governor Dewey had endorsed President Truman's proposal. I read everything I could find regarding the Governor's statement, but I did not find one line or one hint that the Governor endorsed anything with respect to Turkey. He talked about Greece; yes. He endorsed aid and assistance to Greece; and I, too, endorse aid and assistance to Greece. I think almost every citizen of the United States endorses aid and assistance to Greece under certain conditions. Greece is one of the idols of this country. Greece has made great contributions to civilization, both in ancient and in modern times. In the United States there are many people of Greek ancestry. All of us have close personal friends among the Greeks in this country—men who have come to the United States from Greece and have made good here and have contributed to our civilization and our kind of life. They are good citizens; they have done a grand job here. So, of course, all of us have great sympathy for them.

Furthermore, the Greeks fought a great war. They held the Italians at bay; they threw Hitler off his schedule and made definite changes necessary in his time table. By their violent opposition to the Italians they delayed him, which was a very great contribution, indeed, so much so, that Hitler had to send his forces into Greece before the Greeks succumbed. The Italian soldiers could not do the job.

So Greece played an important role in the Second World War, as she did in the First World War; and today the conditions in which the Greek people find themselves—the poverty, the suffering, the wreckage which was left behind by the Germans as they retreated—all appeal strongly to our hearts.

So we wish to help Greece and help restore Greece and put her back on her feet. But in my opinion, provision for aid for Greece is included in the pending bill simply to appeal to our sympathies, and to line us up for the more important purpose; namely, a military alliance with Turkey. I know of a great many reasons why there should not be a military alliance between the United States and Turkey, and I desire to touch upon some of them this afternoon.

Mr. President, I wish at this time to have the Senate consider the amendment which I have proposed to exclude Turkey from receiving any assistance under Senate bill 938.

Mr. President, I do not wish to review the history of ancient persecutions. I scarcely think that the religious persecutions which Christians suffered from the Turks for a thousand years should in any way determine our judgment on this bill or upon my amendment. Nor do I believe that the fact that Turkey was our enemy in the first World War should be a consideration of any great moment; nor do I think that the fact that the present Turkish Government does not permit private enterprise in great areas of its economy, should militate against Turkey. After all, that is her business. Likewise, the fact that the Turks have had treaties of friendship with Soviet Russia and with Nazi Germany in the past, or the fact that they have always and persistently acted in behalf of themselves alone, should have little bearing on the pending proposal.

However, Mr. President, I do believe that the reliability of the present Turkish Government should be carefully considered before the Senate rejects my proposed amendment. For my own part, I do not believe that Turkey is a reliable confederate.

Mr. President, in the secret documents which the State Department attempted to present to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in strict confidence, and which it afterward made public to a select group of 10 newspapermen, are to be found some very interesting summaries of Turkish activity during the recent World War. In 1939, on May 12, the Turkish Government concluded an agreement with England for mutual assistance in case of aggressive war in the Mediterranean region. We discovered that on June 10 of 1940, on the occasion of the Italian declaration of war against Great Britain and France, Great Britain asked for implementation of its alliance for mutual assistance with Turkey. The Turkish Government declined to act. That is when they showed their true colors; that is when Germany looked as if she might be successful in her wild venture to conquer the world; and in that great hour of German supremacy, the Turkish Government declined to act.

Shortly thereafter, on July 18 of 1940, Turkey signed a commercial agreement with Germany.

On June 18 in 1941, the Turkish Government signed a 10-year friendship act with the Nazi government. On October 9 of 1941, the Turkish Government signed a commercial agreement with the Nazi government providing for an exchange of goods valued at 100,000,000 Turkish lira. Germany was to provide steel and war materials in exchange for Turkish raw materials, including 90,000 tons of chrome in each of the years 1943 and 1944. Turkey entered into a lend-lease or a lease-lend agreement with Germany in those days, for an exchange of war goods with the Nazis. On June 2, 1942, a new commercial agreement between Germany and Turkey was arrived at. On September 29, 1942, it was an-

nounced that Turkey had contracted to send about one-half of its annual production of chrome to the Krupp munitions plant in exchange for German arms. In April 1943 a new Nazi-Turkish trade agreement was signed. What was that chrome to be used for? It was to be used to make superior weapons with which to destroy American youths, and the youths of other countries.

During all this time, Mr. President, Great Britain and the United States and the Soviet Union were desperately and continuously attempting to prevent the shipment of chrome and other raw materials to Germany through the expedient of preclusive purchase. The Turks were able to hold us up for an extravagant price, and did so without batting an eyelash. During all this time, Mr. President, the British, the Russians, and the Americans were attempting to have Turkey enter the war on the side of the Allies, and Great Britain in particular was continuously attempting to persuade Turkey to honor its treaty agreement of mutual assistance signed with the British on May 12, 1939. Indeed, at the conference of Tehran, the Allies agreed that Turkey should enter the war, and President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and President Inonu of Turkey had a conference in Cairo on December 4, 5, and 6 of 1943, reviewing the general military and political situation.

Nothing came of this; exports to Germany were not stopped, and on February 10, 1944, since Turkey refused to budge from a policy of inaction, Anglo-Turkish military staff talks, which had been underway for several months, were suspended. We gave them up as a bad job. We finally decided that there was no hope that Turkey would come in on our side at that critical moment in World War II.

Finally, on April 20, 1944, under intense Anglo-American pressure, the Turkish Government announced that it was stopping the shipment of chrome into Germany. On May 24, 1944, Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons, denounced the Turkish Government, and attacked its policy during the war. On June 14, 1944, Foreign Minister Eden stated that the British Government was profoundly disturbed by the fact that the Turkish Government, by allowing German vessels to pass through the Dardanelles from the Black Sea into the Aegean Sea, had helped to increase German naval strength in the Aegean Sea.

That is the way they used the Dardanelles. The Dardanelles is an important point in the whole controversy, the whole issue. We must bear in mind what happened according to Foreign Minister Eden. He told what use they had made of the Dardanelles. Finally on August 2, 1944, when it was apparent to everyone Germany had lost the war, the Turkish Government severed economic and diplomatic relations with Germany. She of course continued those relationships with Japan. The German spy system in Turkey was simply transferred to the Japanese, and it was not until February

23, 1945, that Turkey declared war against Germany and Japan.

Mr. President, is there anybody in the Senate of the United States who is willing to stand up and justify on any basis the course of action pursued by Turkey during the past war? I ask the question, Is there anything in the record of the present Turkish Government which leads any Senator to believe that Turkish Government is reliable?

Mr. President, it is one of those small ironies of history that the German military equipment which the Turkish Government obtained during the war cannot now be supplied and serviced by the arms manufacturers of Germany. It is ironic that the Senate is now asked to supplement with American equipment the Nazi military equipment obtained at the expense of double-crossing her allies, of bleeding the American taxpayer, of sending to their death additional American boys. But that is the proposal before us.

Apparently Turkey believed that the Nazis were going to win the war, because they geared their military equipment to Nazi production. Turkey in reality was accepting lend-lease from Germany. Of course, some Senator may suggest that we were unable to supply the Turks with arms during the war. Is there anybody in the Senate who believes that at a time when we were distributing lend-lease to all parts of the world we would not have supplied the Turks with arms if the Turks had been willing to enter the war?

As I see it, Mr. President, there is nothing in the history of Turkey in which the American people can place their confidence. A nation that violates its sworn agreement and supplies essentials to our enemies, a nation that made a choice of the Nazis against America in the last war, does not deserve selfless consideration from us now.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the fact that the Russian Government has demanded a revision of the Montreux Convention of July 1936, which returned the Dardanelles to Turkish sovereignty. That agreement also permitted Turkey to rearm the Straits.

Both Britain and Russia protested against the manner in which Turkey permitted Nazi war vessels to pass through the Straits during the war. The United States, Russia, and Great Britain have all three stated over and over again that the Montreux Agreement must be rewritten. A number of notes have passed back and forth between the British, American, Russian, and Turkish Governments, in accordance with the agreement of these governments to review the whole question of the status of Turkish control of the Straits.

Mr. President, our State Department and our Chief Executive agreed to review the question of the Dardanelles at Potsdam, and in a series of diplomatic notes since that conference everybody acknowledges that the manner in which the Turkish Government handled the Straits in the last war was reprehensible. Yet, today the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is asking us to arm the Turkish Government, to assume its military obligations, and, in effect, to throw the weight of America solidly be-

hind exclusive Turkish domination and armed control of the Dardanelles.

We agreed to review the question. Now, in effect, we refuse to review it. We voted to bring before the United Nations any situation endangering the peace. Now we refuse to do so. If the Dardanelles is a possible cause of war, why does not the administration bring the question before the United Nations? Why does our State Department, in its unlimited arrogance, assume on behalf of the world to make a unilateral decision to maintain Turkish sovereignty and armed control over the Dardanelles? In effect, Mr. President, this is the decision which the Senate is being asked to make in voting to arm the Turkish Government.

And who, Mr. President, asked us to do this? Has the Turkish Government in the past 6 months appealed to us for aid? It is my distinct impression that we have received no request whatsoever from the Turkish Government, except a request to our Export-Import Bank for a loan. The British did not ask us to lend money or to send a military mission to Turkey. They did not ask us to arm the Turks, so far as the record is concerned. I think that statement stands up. Something might have been done behind some kind of curtain other than an iron curtain, but I have no knowledge of that, and so I am presuming that Britain did not ask us to arm the Turks.

After Turkey declared war on February 23, 1945, the whole question of the Dardanelles was discussed at Potsdam, and President Truman stated his belief that "one of the persistent causes for wars in Europe in the last two centuries has been the selfish control of the waterways of Europe. We proposed that regulations for such navigation be provided by international authorities."

I recall that we fought World War I for the freedom of the seas. That was the real issue. If Germany had not violated the freedom of the seas I sincerely doubt that the United States would have gone to war with Germany. Freedom of the seas was the issue that brought us into the war, and now we are attempting to deny to the great Soviet Union freedom of the seas.

I have no particular love for Russia. They have done many things that I do not like. I often heard my father say, when I was a small boy, that he would be glad to return to his native land of Sweden to fight the Russians. He had an intense hatred of Russia, as most Swedes do—a great fear of them. They have had many an unpleasantness, many a war in the past. I was brought up in that kind of atmosphere and taught at my mother's knee not to like the Russians. One does not get away from those old prejudices very easily. But, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], stated a few moments ago in the most eloquent speech I have heard in this Chamber since I have been a Member, we are attempting to deny Russia the freedom of the seas by one subterfuge or another. "Do not let them go through the Dardanelles. Bottle them up. Encompass them. Encircle them. Keep them out." We do not even want

them to have a navy. And yet we fought World War I for freedom of the seas. We have slipped a long way since Wilson made his pronouncement and laid down his ultimatum based on the freedom of the seas.

After the Potsdam Conference on October 2, 1945, Turkey asked the United States for a \$500,000,000 loan to be granted for 30 years. Again, on February 6, 1946, Turkey submitted a detailed list indicating capital goods that she wished to obtain. Since over a year ago, Turkey, so far as I know, has made no request whatsoever for a loan, for a military mission, or for any other assistance from the United States.

Mr. President, in substance we have bluntly told the United Nations: we have decided that the Dardanelles shall remain in Turkish hands. Our State Department has decided to take over the armed forces of the Turkish Government, to arm, advise, guide and direct the military preparedness of Turkey. Mr. President, who asked us to do that? The Turks? The British? The British, Mr. President, already have a military mission in Turkey. The British have already extended a dozen separate loans to the Turkish Government, in practically every case for armaments.

Mr. President, the Turkish Government is a member of the International World Bank and of the International Monetary Fund. The Turkish Government has apparently over \$200,000,000 of gold reserves. The Turkish Government is in a good financial position. Why, Mr. President, does not the Turkish Government seek a loan from the International Bank? Of course, if it obtains such a loan our Army and Navy could not attach as a condition to it that an American military mission should be permitted to run loose in Turkey. There is no question, Mr. President, but what, with the excellent financial position of the Turkish Government, that the International Bank would grant the loan.

Why then, Mr. President, has our Government, when it has not been requested to do so, and when an adequate alternative exists, why does our Government, in a passion of fear and hysteria, attempt to stampede the Senate of the United States into a decisive and far-reaching change in our national foreign policy? Is there somebody in the State or War Department with an inferiority complex, who feels that we must wave our massive Navy and Army and air power over every village and crossroads in the Near and Middle East? Has the Hitlerian ego, has the hunger for military glory, has the passion for expansion infected the souls of our military high command? What in God's name could cause us to propose such a policy without regard to the history of the Turkish nation, especially its actions in the last war; without regard to our commitments to the United Nations, without regard to our own often repeated declarations that the Dardanelles must be reexamined, without regard to the financial security of the Turkish Government, without waiting for any request from the Turkish Government, in what frenzied night-



mare, in what smoke-filled room could such a policy have been conceived?

I say, Mr. President, that the financial position of the Turkish Government is excellent. When we look at the export and import records of Turkey for the past 10 years we find that their exports in 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 far outstrip their imports. Indeed, for those 4 years their exports were millions of lira above their imports, and roughly, 80 percent greater than were their exports between 1936 and 1941. Their exports have increased 80 percent over what they were just a few years ago. Where can one find another country in the whole world, outside the United States, in that favored condition? The exports from the United States have been due to the amount of money loaned to every other country with which to buy our exports. We have not sold very much for cash on the barrel head. All our sales have been instigated, inspired, and stimulated by loans.

When we examine the Turkish expenditures for armaments we discover that their expenditures run almost one-half of their total budget. We discover also that that budget has substantially increased as the years have gone by. We discover that the millions of lira in circulation in Turkey have risen from 194,000,000 in 1938 to 931,000,000 lira in 1946. We discover that the foreign exchange holdings of the Central Bank in Turkey are at the all-time high. In 1938, for example, they held 5,700,000 lira, and on December 7, 1946, their holdings in foreign exchange were 201,900,000 lira. They have a positive foreign trade balance with high foreign exchange holdings. They settled their lend-lease account in cash, the first nation to do so. In fact, they paid within 30 days after the effective date of the agreement.

Mr. President, from those famous secret documents that the State Department gave to the 10 newspapermen I wish to quote a section on public debt on Turkey:

Turkey's foreign debt is approximately 268,000,000 lira. This will be increased to the extent that Turkey draws on recent credits. The bulk of the foreign debt is an obligation to Great Britain, and some of it is repayable in Turkish lira. The estimated annual burden of service charges, including retirement of principal, is approximately 17,000,000, lira, only about 25 percent of which is said to be payable in gold or foreign exchange. Turkey at present can meet these obligations.

Here is an additional paragraph from the section in this secret document entitled "Turkey's Economic Position":

Turkey's principal difficulty is that of meeting the economic and financial burden of maintaining a large standing army. This expense costs the Turkish Government not far from one-half of its annual revenues and requires foreign exchange exceeding that available from current income.

Mr. President, this is one of the most damnable propositions ever presented to the Senate of the United States. The State Department itself, in its own secret document, demonstrates that the present foreign exchange holdings of the Central Bank are 201,900,000 lira. It then points out that the annual payment on the foreign Turkish debt, including payment on principal, amounts to 17,-

000,000 lira per year, only one-fourth of which is payable in gold or foreign exchange. And, finally, the State Department document states that the Turkish military expenses require "foreign exchange exceeding that available from current income."

Mr. President, our national debt is \$260,000,000,000. Our debt is measured in billions of dollars, not millions. One billion dollars is 1,000 times a million dollars. Turkey's national debt is 268,000,000 lira: We pay six or seven billion dollars a year in interest; they are paying 17,000,000 lira. They have holdings of over 200,000,000; yet our State Department, without any request from the Turkish Government, asks us to pay for the Turkish armaments because the Turkish Government "requires foreign exchange exceeding that available from current income."

Mr. President, is not that a damnable proposal? The American people, suffering under heavy taxation, poured out their blood and wealth while Turkey profited. The Turkish Government today is in the best financial shape in its history, with available foreign exchange—plenty of it—and our State Department proposes that we subsidize everything the Turks need over and above their foreign exchange "available from current income." The American people are tremendously interested in current income. The American people want to see our budget balanced. As a matter of fact, the American people would like to see our taxes lowered; they would like to see our national debt retired. As one Congressman said, "We should be asking for a loan from Turkey."

Mr. President, perhaps the American people would be more sanguine, more ready to take funds from their current income to pay the bills of the Turkish Government if that Government were a democracy. But when, as is well known, these funds from our "current income" are to be expended in behalf of a Government which has been a dictatorship for 24 years, some doubt arises, even in the minds of the most fearful of our countrymen.

The New York Times of March 29, 1947, carried a startling story about the so-called freedom of the press in Turkey. I ask that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASING OF TURKISH PRESS CONTROL IS SOUGHT WITH LOAN PLAN AS LEVER—PROGRESSIVES DECRY "CHINESE WALL" AROUND COUNTRY—SEVERE PENALTIES PRESCRIBED FOR REPORTS DEEMED OBJECTIONABLE

ISTANBUL, Turkey, March 28.—In the light of the latest developments in Turkish-United States relations, progressive individuals and newspapers are renewing their efforts to ease what is considered to be the difficult position of foreign press correspondents here.

A leading opposition paper, Vatan, which is campaigning for freedom of the press, editorially urged the government today to accord more facilities and cheaper cable rates to foreign correspondents "if we want to pull down the Chinese wall surrounding us."

Interpretative reporting here is hazardous in view of the Turkish law relating to the dissemination of information. Although unofficial censorship of cabled press messages ended last June and no signs of visible, direct censorship exist, correspondents still face what is known as the German system: Censorship at the source, which puts correspondents on the carpet for printed cables judged by the authorities to be objectionable.

The Turks, who still are shy of foreigners, consider the correspondent as a sort of spy, one to be avoided. No government officer except the Premier is allowed to make a statement to the press without authorization from the top and it took the proposed American loan to induce Premier Receppeker to grant an interview recently.

The penal laws that apply to foreign correspondents and the local press have convinced reporters that an assignment in Turkey is no easy job. Article 140 prescribes a minimum of 5 years in prison for anyone sending abroad unfounded or exaggerated information on Turkey's internal political situation that might harm her dignity in foreign countries. The penalty applies to the person giving such information and to the correspondent who sends it.

Article 158 prescribes a minimum of 3 years in prison for anyone insulting the Turkish President or writing aggressively about him. A penalty of 1 to 6 years' imprisonment is provided in article 159 for any person insulting the moral personality of the national assembly, the Turkish Republic, the government, the armed forces, the police, or the judicial system.

Article 162 provides that the act of transmitting a story or information that the law considers criminal is a crime.

The government has argued that the laws are not invoked. They are enforceable, however, and hang over every reporter's head.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this report demonstrates clearly that there is no real freedom of the press in Turkey. The Turkish Government promptly suspended the correspondent's privileges to file cables because he wrote the article. This, I believe, happened on April 3. On April 5 his rights were restored pending the arrival of another correspondent from Athens. An American correspondent was gagged because he told the truth to the American people.

Mr. President, the secret documents which our State Department furnished to 10 newspapermen, in its summary of the present situation in Turkey, have some other interesting things to say. Permit me to quote:

While the Turks are almost unanimous in supporting the government's foreign policy, there is considerable difference of opinion among them about the direction of internal affairs. Less than 2 years ago the Turkish Government took the courageous step of licensing the existence of opposition political parties.

That is from the Department's report, which is doubtless authentic.

I trust that the Senate notes that the adjective "courageous" comes from our State Department, also, that they see nothing strange in the fact that a license for a political party is necessary. Again:

One major opposition party emerged—the democratic party—which was well supported in elections to the National Assembly in the summer of 1946. Other political groups, however, have not won many adherents, while such subversive and antigovernment minority groups as do exist, are not powerful, and

are under effective control by the police and security services.

In other words, Mr. President, the police suppress all political parties and groups that do not agree with the government. Why does not the State Department say so and get it over with? Permit me to quote further:

The Democrats insist upon the removal of certain restrictive laws which they regard as unconstitutional, such as the press law, by means of which the government exercises somewhat arbitrary control over the Turkish press. They also strongly condemn the Government for its inability to take effective steps to improve critical economical conditions and to halt the rising cost of living.

It is a terrible crime, is it not? Quite a few Members of the Senate would run into difficulty if ours was that kind of a government.

From the Newsweek magazine of May 27, 1946, pages 41 and 42, I find this statement:

When the Democrats began to organize, however, they ran into trouble. They accused civil authorities of preventing them from setting up headquarters on a nationwide scale. They declared provincial state governors refused to allow Democratic rallies, and constantly intercepted mail and telephone messages. They said policemen beat up their followers. Finally, as a protest, they issued a manifesto declaring the Government nondemocratic, and decided they would boycott both municipal and national elections. President Inonu seized upon this action to imply that the Democrats were actually Communists who wanted to discredit the Turkish Government in the eyes of other states. He promised Turkey would fight political parties inspired from abroad and acting as foreign instruments.

That goes to show how governments nowadays, whenever they encounter any great difficulty, simply yell "Communism, communism, communism!"

Mr. President, these same Democrats, whom President Inonu of Turkey called Communists, drew up a program in the elections of 1946 opposed to the present governmental ownership of mines, public utilities, textiles, and shoe factories. That is quite a crime, is it not? They are opposed to the government operation of businesses, factories, and industries, and for that crime they are termed "Communists." These free-enterprise advocates must be a queer breed of Communists. A political party opposing a government's total ownership of utilities, mines, factories, et cetera, is called Communist by the ruling political clique. That is name-calling with a vengeance. We do not even go so far over here.

By no stretch of the imagination can Turkey be said to be on the road to democracy, even though our State Department gracefully approves the brutal, harsh, and ruthless dictatorship that controls that nation. The Senate ought to be more realistic. Military aid and assistance to this Government is aid and assistance to a Fascist military dictatorship.

Mr. President, a heavy and serious responsibility has been thrust upon us without rhyme or reason. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has asked us to take from the pockets of the American taxpayers millions of dollars to support a government whose political

irresponsibility is demonstrated by historical fact. He has asked us to support a government which is essentially military and dictatorial. He has asked us to give money to a government in excellent financial position; indeed, in better financial position than is the Government of the United States. We are asked to repudiate our commitments to the United Nations and, in effect, to guarantee Turkish control of the Dardanelles. We are asked, in effect, to assume responsibility for the maintenance of Turkish mercenary Janizaries. It is my fixed conviction that the American people want no part or parcel of this proposal. I urge the Senate, in all good conscience, to adopt the proposed amendment, striking Turkey from the pending measure.

I now send to the desk the amendment which I have discussed and ask that it lie on the table, to be called up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no other Senator who wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am still wondering—and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]—whether we cannot at least move forward to the extent of adopting the committee amendments. It is my understanding that even those who hold the position of the able Senator from Colorado are in favor of the committee amendments, and I should like to get the bill to the point at least where we can start tomorrow with the real debate, which will be upon just such amendments as the able Senator from Colorado proposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I join the Senator in that desire. I shall be glad to have the committee amendments adopted. I shall not oppose them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that the Senate proceed with the committee amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume that will not foreclose amendments to any part of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 11, after "government", to strike out "and" and at the end of line 14, to strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and "and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with

the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this act; and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 15, to insert the following language, as heretofore amended:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

- (1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;
- (2) If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and
- (3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 7. The chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance under this act shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this act as the President shall prescribe.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. This amendment does not make it perfectly clear whether there must be a chief of mission to a country, or exactly what his powers are to be. I wonder if the Senator has been informed as to what sort of an organization we are to have in Greece.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Committee on Foreign Relations was advised that the form of the administrative organization will be a chief of mission in Greece and a chief of mission in Turkey, and that the chief of mission shall organize his own staff.

Mr. TAFT. I was interested in the question whether we can avoid what has happened in so many places throughout the world, where three or four different departments of the Government have representatives, sometimes each of them handing out money and working at cross-purposes. I wonder if there is any assurance that in this case that will not occur, and that all Americans will substantially be under the direction of a chief of mission.



Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, after line 11. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] be made the pending question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have sent the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to strike out "and Turkey"; in line 6, to strike out "their governments" and insert in lieu thereof "its government"; in line 9, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; in line 10, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; on page 2, lines 7 and 8, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; in line 15, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; in line 17, to strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country"; on page 3, line 5, to strike out "or of Turkey"; in line 6, to strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country"; in line 8, to strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country"; on page 4, line 4, to strike out "or of Turkey"; and in lines 12 and 13, to strike out "to either Greece or Turkey."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

#### SALE OF COAST GUARD SITE AT FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1009, that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the bill be presently considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the base six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill is of purely local interest. For some time there has been authority in the Coast Guard to transfer sites in Florida to other locations. Several years ago legislation was passed authorizing the sale of one of these sites to the city of Fort Lauderdale. Financial arrangements have all been completed, and the transaction is ready for consummation. The difficulty is that there must be authority both to sell and to acquire the property. That right expires on the 29th of this month. The bill must go to

the House. I therefore ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 3 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes," as amended (Public Law No. 655, 79th Cong.; 60 Stat. 901), is hereby amended by striking out "6 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "12 months."

#### RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 11, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 10 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Anton J. Lukaszewicz, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin. Mr. Lukaszewicz is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 10, 1946.

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.  
William F. Busser, of Pennsylvania.  
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.  
Gilon Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.  
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.  
Miss Constance R. Harvey, of New York.  
John Frémont Melby, of Illinois.  
Bolard More, of Ohio.  
Miss Katherine E. O'Connor, of Indiana.  
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.  
Halleck L. Rose, of Nebraska.  
Fred K. Salter, of Georgia.  
William P. Snow, of Maine.  
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in line of the Navy:

(\*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

##### LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

\*Classman, Delwin W.  
\*Grening, George M.  
\*Joyce, Theodore W.

##### ENSIGNS

Albert, William H.  
Alderson, John T.  
Applebach, Richard O.  
Armstrong, Richard G.  
Bagger, Gilbert D.  
Baker, Morton S.  
\*Banner, Roy R.  
\*Barber, George C.  
Barbour, Nell G.  
Bauch, Leland W.  
Betts, Joseph E.  
Bishop, Lewis S.  
Bohmert, Gerald G.  
Bueler, Charles M.  
Carmant, Frederick, Jr.  
Carter, Wallace R.  
Cartwright, Richard L.  
Chillemi, Richard L.  
Cohn, William P.

Coleman, Eddie T., Jr.  
\*Colenda, Frank  
Condra, Kenneth I.  
Cook, Berdel A.  
Cramer, Maley O., Jr.  
Cunningham, Thomas F.  
Curless, James P.  
Davis, Leslie D.  
\*Davis, William J., Jr.  
\*Deibler, William D.  
DeWerd, Theodore J.  
Doling, Lloyd L.  
Douglas, Stephen P., Jr.  
Drake, John D. K.  
Dwyer, William V.  
\*Egeland, Andrew M.  
Faulk, Joseph R.  
Fitzwater, Harry E.  
Flanigan, Frank, Jr.  
Freeland, Harold H.  
Friedrichsen, Leslie P.  
Fuller, Richard, Jr.  
Gardner, Walter T., Jr.  
Gibbs, John D., Jr.  
Goelz, Herbert E.  
Gorman, Donald V.  
Gray, Gordon L.  
Gray, Theodore R.  
Gresham, John I.  
Grove, Nevett S.  
Harmon, William C.  
Harrison, Alan W.  
Hart, Harry S.  
Hause, Joseph R.  
Hoover, John R.  
Hughes, Thomas J., Jr.  
Jackson, James A.  
Johnstone, Frank L.  
Jones, Edward H.  
Kearny, Francis C., Jr.  
Kebort, Leo R.  
Klippstein, Thomas A.  
Krueger, Roland E., Jr.  
Kwitkoski, Walter J.  
Lamb, Arthur W.  
Landess, Herbert S.  
Markham, Paul E.  
McGucken, Paul M.  
McKinney, Clyde B.  
\*Mize, Louis R.  
Morgan, Lawrence E.  
Mosser, Douglas  
Murrill, Robert L.  
O'Meara, Charles K.  
Powell, Arthur E.  
\*Quick, Thomas J.  
Rappuhn, Alfred A., Jr.  
Riggan, James M., Jr.  
Riordan, Gilbert A.  
Roberts, William K.  
Rogers, Donald L.  
Ryder, Donald F.  
\*Sar, Raymond V.  
Schmucker, Stanley K.  
Schniedwind, Robert F.  
Schwartz, Mathew J.  
Serrie, John A., Jr.  
Sholes, Charles W.  
Simons, Joseph T.  
Sisterhenm, William H.  
\*Slattery, Francis L.  
Smelz, Jervis L.  
Smerdon, John E., Jr.  
Smith, George E.  
Smith, James J.  
Smith, James V.  
Smith, John E.  
Smith, Wendell K.  
Spruit, Robert E.  
Stair, Robert N.  
Stassevitch, Paul S.  
Stewart, Richard C.  
Stout, Harry R.  
Sup, George C.  
Swanstrom, Willis E.  
Sweeder, Stanley E.  
Taylor, Huling F., Jr.  
\*Torrey, Julian A.  
Tribble, Gordon B. B.  
Valentine, Earnest  
Vehorn, Charles M.  
Vrolyk, Raymond F.  
Walery, Kenneth F.  
Waring, Everett D.  
Warren, Burtis "W"  
West, Gordon R.  
Whitely, Joseph M.  
Whitney, William J.  
Whittaker, Gordon S.  
Williams, Elmer R.  
Williams, James E.  
Wilson, James G.  
\*Windley, William D.  
\*Woolridge, Arthur R., Jr.  
Caskey, James C.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

##### ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Chace, John F.  
Moorman, Elmer R.  
Watkins, George S.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

##### ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

McCreary, Arthur D.

##### ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Babler, Richard F.  
Bach, Charles F., Jr.  
Beamon, Charles W.  
Benz, Norman E.  
Carothers, Rodney P.  
Comfort, John R.  
Curtis, Ralph E.  
Day, Robert D.  
De Pourtales, Louis J.  
E.  
Fairfield, George W.  
Fargason, James E.  
Farnham, Benjamin L.  
Goodreau, George H.  
Harris, Melvin W.  
Hart, Billy W.  
Holland, Donald E.  
Jongeward, Keith W.  
Kees, John D.  
Keidel, Charles J.  
McAdams, Robert J.  
McKenna, James E.  
Mulvey, Paul L.  
O'Leary, Joseph J.  
Pooler, Richard P.  
Pope, George S., Jr.  
Pimm, Jules R.  
Robinson, James A.  
Ronayne, William D.  
Sampson, William J.  
Schmidt, Maurice L.  
Schmitt, Joseph D.

Senulis, Alexander D. Bauer, Allen F.  
 Sherrell, David P. Hill, William H.  
 Simpson, Harvey Odell, Jack G.  
 Slater, Thornton L. Parfitt, Arthur R.  
 Smith, William C., Jr. Scott, Joseph E.  
 Smith, William C. Meyer, Milton, Jr.  
 Starbody, John L. Smith, Frank W., Jr.  
 Taylor, William L. Crowell, Julian R., Jr.  
 Williams, George W. Jordan, Robert L.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE  
 RANK OF ENSIGN

Burch, Bobby F. Michael, Edwin M.  
 Chadwick, Dean O. Mulder, William H.  
 Daub, Leland A. Ross, Willard A.  
 Ellis, Darl A. White, Richard D.  
 Hoskins, Dalton Young, Robert "C"  
 Malvin, David W. Scanlan, Melvin E.  
 Marron, James P.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF  
 OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Brimer, Eugene L., Jr. Nystul, Oliver G.  
 Carney, Bruce H. Sancier, Henry J.  
 Crossmire, George B. Scrivener, Charles A.  
 Fowler, James M. Shearn, Raymond S.  
 Kraske, Leonard M.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF TORPEDOMAN

Van Gorder, Keith R.

CHIEF PHARMACIST

Baker, Lewis G.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In the secret of Thy presence, O Lord, how our souls take delight, and how precious are the lessons we learn at Thy feet. Even in the shadows Thou abidest and aboundest. Keep alive in our hearts the One who faced failure, unsealed earth's tombs, and brought to man an abiding faith and an enduring courage.

Our Father, we seek today for urgent wills and for constructive spirits in all that we do, that the Congress may have a most honorable part in our national life and character. Do Thou sustain us in mind and heart that, being submissive to Thy wisdom, we may be led to the solutions of the provocative situations in which we are placed.

In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of cer-

tain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. National Archives.
6. Office of Scientific Research and Development.
7. Railroad Retirement Board.

JEFFERSON'S FIRST INAUGURAL  
 ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of April 2, 1947, the Chair designates the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to read Jefferson's first inaugural address on Monday, April 14, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight Saturday to file its report on H. R. 3020.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity for the purpose of announcing the program for next week, and particularly to announce that if the Committee on Education and Labor reports the so-called labor bill before Saturday midnight it is proposed that a request be made for a rule on Monday, and then to call up the bill on Tuesday. I do not know how much time will be given for general debate, but it is expected that the consideration of that bill will continue through next week to Thursday or Friday, or for such time as may be necessary to complete its consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman give us the number of that bill?

Mr. HALLECK. H. R. 3020.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the rule be taken up on Monday in the House?

Mr. HALLECK. No. It is expected that the application for the rule will be made on Monday. If the rule is granted, it will be filed on Monday and then could be called up on Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the program for Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot give an answer to that at the moment. As I understand, it is District day, so any District business would be in order for Monday. Beyond that I know of nothing further. If there is anything further to be considered on Monday, I shall later announce it. I wanted to make this announcement relative to anticipated con-

sideration of the so-called labor bill as the program for next week.

Mr. RANKIN. If the rule is granted, as I understand, the labor bill will be taken up on Tuesday?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. It will probably take several days to dispose of it?

Mr. HALLECK. I would assume so. I do not know how much time will be allowed under the rule that the Rules Committee may report. Certainly, a considerable amount of time will be taken under the 5-minute rule in the reading of the bill for amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. The chairman of the committee is present. I wonder how much time he is going to ask for general debate.

Mr. HARTLEY. That has not yet been determined.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just want to serve notice on you that I want you all to be here on next Monday, because I am going to read to you one of the greatest documents ever promulgated in all the history of this Government, Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address.

I want every one of you to hear it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 12, 2 years will have elapsed since this Nation and the world lost one of its greatest citizens, an outstanding man who devoted his life to the cause of humanity, to preserving freedom in



our Nation, and to bringing freedom and the democratic way of life to the world. Since the House will not be in session on Saturday, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record in regard to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution passed by the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include two letters.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes in connection with Pan-American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### WOODWARD, OKLA.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I assume that many of you have noticed in the press this morning the report of a terrific tornado which struck the very heart and center of my congressional district last night. The city of Woodward, Okla., a little city of about 7,000 people, one of the most progressive, up-to-date, and wide-awake cities in the State of Oklahoma, was in the very center of this tornado. The latest report I have is that they have counted 100 persons killed and over 800 seriously injured. According to the meager press reports available at this time approximately one-third of the town was completely devastated by this storm. Red Cross officials have today advised me that substantial funds have already been allocated to aid and assist in the disaster, and that other funds will be available to meet the necessities. Seven hundred and fifty tents, 2,000 cots, and 6,000 blankets have been moved into Woodward and a tent city is being established to temporarily house the destitute. An Army field kitchen is being set up to take care of the food requirements.

One of the striking things heard over the radio was a report from two ex-combat servicemen who survived and said that in their experience overseas they had never witnessed anything more horrifying or more devastating than this tornado that struck in the night without warning. Some smaller towns over in the State of Texas, right near the Texas line, were completely annihilated by this terrific storm.

From reports thus far available, this is perhaps the most tragic and far-reaching disaster ever inflicted on any community by a tornado.

I have assured the citizens of Woodward that I am certain the Congress of the United States stands ready to provide any emergency assistance needed.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a sermon-address delivered by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay from the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn., on January 19, 1947, entitled "Private Property."

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday to file reports on H. R. 495 and H. R. 1448.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW: AFTER GREECE, TURKEY, KOREA, AND INDIA, WHERE DO WE GO?

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country who are searching for light on the global proposal of the President have found little in the news, or in the Congress, to help them come to any firm conclusion.

Most of the speeches around Washington supporting the proposal have been very much on the rabble-rousing side and fail to explore the basic facts concerning the issue.

In the morning paper we find two or three items of great interest. First, the AP dispatch from London quotes a highly placed British Government source as saying that the American State Department official in Greece took a much graver view of the internal and international ramifications of the Greek situation than did the British.

The British, according to this authority, did not think their withdrawal would pave the way for Communists to seize control of the Greek Government or that guerrilla fighting, while a con-

siderable nuisance, is great enough to constitute a danger of real civil war. While they call it an Anglo-American policy, they make it clear that they did not ask for it, or propose it.

There is no doubt that a transfusion for Korea and a blood-letting for Uncle Sam to the tune of \$600,000,000 is in the making and will be presented to Congress after the disposal of the Greek-Turkish question.

Another item by the UP quotes Indian sources as saying that the United States, in another anticommunism move, joined recently in Anglo-Indian Army talks in London on the defense of India, after the British withdrawal in June 1948. The talks were reported to have revolved primarily around the question of what American and British assistance might be necessary for India to guard the northern "back door" against Communist infiltration after the British leave.

The American people would like to know: After Greece, Turkey, Korea, and India, where do we go?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and to include an article by Frank Walrop in this morning's Times-Herald.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by Brigadier General Kelser of the United States Army.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a brief filed by Mr. John C. Williamson, of the national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, before the Committee on Ways and Means, with a copy of a newspaper article which is part of the brief.

#### HENRY FORD

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in my home city of Detroit funeral services are being conducted for a fellow townsman whose record as an industrialist, philanthropist, and humanitarian stands unequalled in modern times. I speak of the late Henry Ford, whose name is known the world over and is synonymous with the best traditions of good citizenship and progressive business. He was a pioneer in an industry which brought growth and wealth to Detroit and credit to himself and his family. His death is Detroit's and the world's loss.

Before sundown this evening, all that is mortal of Henry Ford will be lowered into a grave in Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Mich., in a small family plot not far from his birthplace. Henry Ford made this world a better place in which to live and his passing will be

felt in every walk of life for many, many years to come.

I am one of the many thousands of Detroiters who count Henry Ford as a former boss. It was my privilege some 12 years ago to work in the vast Ford plant at River Rouge. There I had an opportunity to see at first hand and to take an active part in the mass-production program of this great automotive genius. It was an experience that I shall not forget because I felt myself a part of this great industrial empire and joined hands with countless thousands of my fellow citizens who depended upon Ford for their daily bread.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two editorials which appeared in the Washington Star of April 8 and the Washington Daily News of April 9 and which I believe typical of the editorial comment carried in virtually every newspaper in the country when the passing of Mr. Ford became known.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 9, 1947]

HENRY FORD

It was 83 years from candlelight to candlelight for Henry Ford. He was born 15 years before his friend, Tom Edison, invented the electric light. As he died, at his home Monday night, a flood had cut off electricity and heat, thus dramatizing the changes of his lifetime and our dependence upon them.

Mr. Ford must be listed among the few great mechanical geniuses of history. It even may be conjectured that his effect upon the trend of human affairs perhaps was as great in its way as that of Napoleon, or Genghis Khan, or of Caesar.

At least his record is more remarkable in that it did not involve, as it did in the other cases, war or conquest.

All he attempted to do, as he said, was to take the heavy burdens from men's shoulders and place them upon machines.

Henry Ford did not invent the mass-production system. Eli Whitney introduced that technique a long time before, in the manufacture of Army muskets.

But Henry Ford developed it on a mass scale. He lightened men's labors, improved their efficiency, their wages, and their living standards. He shortened their hours of work.

By mass producing a car to fit the average pocketbook, he put the Nation on wheels. His was the imagination and driving force in creating our vast network of hard-surfaced roads and our great oil industry.

As a byproduct of his endeavors, he created a fortune so vast it is beyond imagination. Yet he lived frugally. His hobby was collections from the past, antiques reminding of the good old days which his imagination had helped hasten into limbo.

Is it good for one man to accumulate so much wealth, or bad? Money is power and we hold, in this country, that too much power in any man's hands is evil. Under present regulations it would be impossible to amass this amount of wealth or anything approaching it.

It also would be impossible to build the industrial organization which has been so beneficial. Our present system, though it seems sound and fair in many respects, is not favorable to the development of Henry Fords. Tax laws and social regulations work against the rugged individualist, which Henry Ford certainly was.

Perhaps this is good. Such power as he has had, in evil hands, could be destructive. But we should give thought to the circumstances, none the less.

The country which Henry Ford helped transform by no means has reached perfection. It must grow. New and improved techniques for working and living must be developed. The last word has not been spoken on industrial techniques, on labor relations, on anything else for that matter.

We must prevent obvious abuses. We must outlaw obvious exploitation, but we must leave the way open for the play of such genius as was Henry Ford's.

[From the Washington Star of April 8, 1947]

HENRY FORD

Henry Ford was a living proof of the efficacy of Emerson's saying about the building of better mousetraps. His career, when summarized, was a demonstration of the ancient law of supply and demand in its best, most notably constructive form. He was one of the principal architects of the modern mechanical age, and his enterprises enriched his country and the world at large in spiritual and cultural as well as in material ways. The inexpensive automobile gave plain people the power to go places quickly, and the effect of its invention has been revolutionary beyond the hopes of its sponsor.

A dreamer in many respects, Mr. Ford, even as a boy, visioned improvements of far-reaching significance. His capacity for imaginative thinking undoubtedly led him astray on occasion, but to it he owed the ultimate dimensions of his empire. Fortunately, a talent for tireless labor matched the genius of his mind. Not until he was very old was it possible for him to rest. Protected from public intrusion at Dearborn during nearly half a century, he spent his time and energy in ceaseless pursuit of ideas. Some of his notions were quixotic. The Peace Ship of 1915 was an example of his tendency to err romantically. His political views often were ruggedly individualistic. He opposed collective bargaining after it had become the standard practice of the Nation. Federal interference in industry irked him. He had made himself a symbol of private enterprise and to him there was no other answer.

Meanwhile, the growth of his interests continued. By 1930 Mr. Ford was regarded as the richest man in the world. His personal tastes and habits remained simple and unpretending. He was devoted to "the old days" and assembled Dearborn Village to prove it. Paradoxically, he favored the latest instruments, the most recently perfected methods of production. His laboratories and experimental shops, barred to outsiders, are a legend. In them things truly magical happened. During the Second World War he lived to see the mass-production systems and methods, of which he was a pioneer, become a major factor in the defeat of our enemies.

The final judgment of the role he played in the American scene may not be feasible at present. He had his fair share of critics, some of them uncharitably bitter. But if he be appraised in terms of increased national wealth, convenience in travel, progress in the making and distribution of useful articles of commerce, rational philanthropy, and patriotism, he must be conceded to have been one of the giants of his era of history.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Kent appearing in the Evening Star of yesterday.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press concerning the recent proposed tax bill.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include a speech by Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, in another a speech by Admiral Clark of the Navy, and in the third a speech by Mr. John F. Vickery.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of social security.

#### AUTHORIZING THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO GRANT EASEMENTS IN LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1844) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but as the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I want to say that this bill, in my opinion, is absolutely necessary. It was reported by the committee unanimously, and I do not think there can possibly be any objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, whenever he deems it advantageous to the Government and upon such terms and conditions as he deems advisable, is hereby authorized on behalf of the United States to grant to any State, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, or to any public-service company, easements in and rights-of-way over lands belonging to the United States which are under his supervision and control. Such grant may include the use of such easements or rights-of-way by public utilities to the extent authorized and under the conditions imposed by the laws of such State relating to use of public highways. Such partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction over the areas covered by such easements or rights-of-way, as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs deems necessary or desirable, is hereby ceded to the State in which the land is located. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to accept or secure on behalf of the United States from the State in which is situated any land conveyed in exchange for any such easement or right-of-way, such jurisdiction as he may deem necessary or desirable over the land so acquired. Any such easement or right-of-way shall be terminated upon abandonment or nonuse of the same and all right, title, and interest in the land covered thereby shall thereupon revert to the United States or its assignee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third



time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two separate editorials on two different subjects.

#### THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, this is the time set for the calling of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

#### FRANCESCO AND NATALIA PICCHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 422) for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889-290; 54 Stat. 671-673; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155) the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Francesco and Natalia Picchi, of Rockford, Ill., to remain permanently in the United States if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "States", strike out the balance of line 8 and all of lines 9 and 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LAWRENCE PORTLAND CEMENT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 654) for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$24,355.06, to Lawrence Portland Cement Co., of Thomaston, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after May 18, 1942, to June 1, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, which period was not included in the regulations of the Office of Price Administration on bituminous coal from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CHARLES A. CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 722) for the relief of Charles A. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to Charles A. Clark, of Ridgewood, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as a result of a collision between the car which he was driving and a United States Army vehicle near Wurtsboro, N. Y., on May 21, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "a collision between the car which he was driving and a United States Army vehicle" and insert "an accident caused by several deer running into the highway."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGAL GUARDIAN OF HUNTER A. HOAGLAND, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 723) for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor of Glen Rock, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of an explosion of a discarded shell in an old abandoned United States Army Camp on Harristown Road, Fair Lawn, N. J., on February 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 828) for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California the sum of \$478.13. Such sum represents the total amount paid by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund of California, as follows:

(1) To Allen D. Cameron, California, and Earle P. Schouten, California, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on February 3, 1939, when the automobile in which they were riding was in collision on the State highway near Vacaville, Calif., with a truck operated in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps. At the time of such accident, the said Allen D. Cameron and Earle P. Schouten were employees of the San Rafael Military Academy, San Rafael, Calif., and the sum of \$382.10 was paid to them by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy with the said San Rafael Military Academy;

(2) To Officer Everett Ingram, of the California Highway Patrol, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on August 25, 1941, when the motorcycle on which he was riding was in collision on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge with a truck operated in the service of the United States Army, and the sum of \$81.78 was paid to him by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy; and

(3) To the State Department of Motor Vehicles for damage to the motorcycle on which Officer Ingram was riding the sum of \$14.25.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 21, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GEORGE CORENEVSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of George Corenevsky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Corenevsky, Honolulu, T. H., the sum of \$1,906.07. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on July 5, 1942, when he was struck while at his home at Ashley and Lowela Avenues, Peninsula, Pearl City, Oahu, T. H., by a stray bullet fired in a fight nearby between two enlisted men of the United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,906.07" and insert "\$1,905.07."

Page 2, line 1, insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED E. WEBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1064) for the relief of Fred E. Weber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred E. Weber, Bradley Beach, Monmouth County, N. J., the sum of \$7,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Fred E. Weber against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by him when the automobile which he was driving on Central Avenue, in the borough of Bradley Beach, was in collision with a United States Army truck on January 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,000" and insert "\$4,226."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEARSON REMEDY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1068) for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the claim of Pearson Remedy Co., Burlington, N. C., for drawback, pursuant to section 3250 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, of tax with respect to distilled spirits used in the manufacture or production of nonbeverage products during the quarter beginning October 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1944, filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue during the month of April 1945, is authorized to be considered and acted upon as if it had been filed within the period of limitations properly applicable thereto. The general manager and secretary and treasurer of the said Pearson Remedy Co., C. M. Houser, was unable on account of illness to file such claim on or

before March 31, 1945, the date of the expiration of the period of limitations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GEORGIA LANSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1091) for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$6,500, to Mrs. Georgia Lanser, of Elkhorn, Wis., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and loss of services sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Navy bus en route from Hertford, N. C., to the naval auxiliary air station at Harvey Point, N. C., on August 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$6,500" and insert "\$4,304.25."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE SPITZER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1092) for the relief of Eugene Spitzer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene Spitzer, of Lake Placid, N. Y., the sum of \$1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of bond declared breached August 13, 1940, because of his failure to depart from the United States on or before December 11, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

DEPENDENTS OF CARL B. SANBORN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 389) for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 751-791), the late Carl B. Sanborn, who died as the result of an explosion which occurred June 16, 1942, in Eaton Canyon, near Pasadena, Calif., while engaged in scientific research for the United States, shall be deemed to have been a civil employee of the United States within the purview of said act, at the time of his death, and compensation for death payable under said act shall accrue from the date of his death and shall be payable to such of his dependents as may qualify under section 10 of said act, under the conditions therein provided, such compensation to be computed in the manner prescribed by said act upon the basis of the monthly pay, respectively, of such Carl B. Sanborn in his employment under the direction of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of the Office for Emergency Management, or upon the basis of monthly pay of \$175 in the event that at the time of death he was serving without compensation. Any compensation for death received by any such dependent under any other workmen's compensation law shall be credited against any compensation which such dependent may receive by reason of this act. No right to benefits shall accrue under this act unless a written claim for compensation is filed under such act of September 7, 1916, as amended within one year from the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENJAMIN GORDON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 400) for the relief of Benjamin Gordon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Benjamin Gordon, Chelsea, Mass., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss in salary sustained when claimant was struck by a United States Coast Guard motor vehicle while alighting from a taxi at or near the intersection of Saratoga and Prescott Streets, East Boston, Mass., on December 6, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account



of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$750."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LESLIE H. ASHLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 986) for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,042 in full settlement of all claims against the United States, due to Leslie H. Ashlock, of Cecelia, Hardin County, Ky., to compensate him for the loss of his right eye which occurred on February 6, 1945, at about 10 o'clock a. m., while and during the time that the said Leslie H. Ashlock was an employee of Gastan & Co., of Louisville, Ky., which company was operating under a contract with the War Department and the United States Government for the baling of all waste paper at Fort Knox, Ky.; the exact injury sustained by the said Leslie H. Ashlock having been caused by a small bomb buried in the paper, which the said Leslie A. Ashlock was handling during the performance of his duties and which bomb exploded and particles thereof striking the said Ashlock in the right eye, thereby producing a contusion of the right eyeball, a partial dislocation of the lens of the right eye, and hemorrhages in the anterior chamber, which has resulted in his complete and total blindness in the aforementioned right eye, all of which was not due to, or caused by, any negligence whatsoever upon the part of the said Leslie H. Ashlock. A search of the waste paper on the floor revealed several whistling bombs of a type used on the infiltration course at the station, upon the Government reservation at Fort Knox, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount herein appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered directly or indirectly to any agent or attorney on account of any service or services claimed to have been or actually rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not to exceed \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,042" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,042 to Leslie H. Ashlock, of Cecelia, Ky."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "States", strike out the bill down to the word "Provided" in line 17, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "for personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred as the result of the explosion of a small bomb at Fort Knox, Ky., on February 6, 1945, while the said Leslie H. Ashlock was engaged in work as an employee of Gastan & Co. in con-

nection with the baling of waste paper at the post dump at Fort Knox."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THOMAS GAMBACORTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1065) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Thomas Gambacorto, the sum of \$6,200.75. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of Thomas Gambacorto and hospital and funeral expenses and property damage sustained when the deceased was driving his wagon on State Highway No. 35, near Eatontown, N. J., and was struck in the rear by an Army-owned vehicle on January 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$6,200.75" and insert "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DONNA L. I. CARLISLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to Donna L. I. Carlisle, of San Jose, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation on account of the death of her son, Arthur W. Lawrence, who was killed on July 22, 1929, by being crushed underneath an Army truck while a trainee at a Citizens Military Training Camp at Fort Missoula, Mont.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADOLPH PFANNENSTIEHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### HENRY BIG DAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2199) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

#### MRS. ELIZABETH KEMPTON BAILEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1176) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey as having entered the United States for permanent residence on July 28, 1938, the date on which she was temporarily admitted as a student.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. FUKU KUROKAWA THURN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1318) for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), and section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), the Attorney General is directed to record the admission of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn to the United States at the port of New York on September 9, 1937, as a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 875) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1222 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 576), and the provisions of section 1223 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 577), and the provisions of section 1224 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 495), or any other provisions of law, or any rules and regulations issued thereunder, the President is authorized to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, a general officer in the Army of the United States, as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and Major General Kuter's appointment to, acceptance of, and service as such representative shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the Army of the United States or any component thereof, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That so long as he remains United States representative to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, Major General Kuter in lieu of his military pay and allowances shall receive such compensation and allowances as the Secretary of State shall prescribe from appropriations made by law for the Department of State.

Sec. 2. In the performance of his duties as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, Major General Kuter shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the War Department, the Military Establishment, or the Army of the United States, or any component thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, after the word "State", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That Major General Kuter shall not remain in this position for more than 2 years after the date of the approval of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LOUISIANA POWER & LIGHT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2248) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a perpetual easement for a right-of-way for transmission-line purposes in, on, and across a portion of Camp Livingston, La., and convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co., its successors and/or assigns, by quitclaim deed, a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston, La., being 200 feet wide and 400 feet long and located adjacent to and on the north side of the Beaver Creek electrical distribution substation of the Louisiana Power & Light Co., on which land to be conveyed the said Beaver Creek substation has been enlarged.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ESTATE OF REUBEN MALKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 341) for the relief of the widow of Reuben Malkin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to the widow of Reuben Malkin, who was killed by being electrocuted on May 28, 1943, while engaged in painting the United States post office at Cumberland, Md., when in the course of his work and without warning the said Reuben Malkin contacted a high-tension feeder line carrying 2300 volts of current into the Federal building. The payment of this sum will be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "widow" and insert "estate."

Page 1, line 6, after "Malkin", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of the said Reuben Malkin."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "the payment of this sum will be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IVA GAVIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 437) for the relief of Iva Gavin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to Iva Gavin, of Muncie, Ind., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses suffered and incurred by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army Air Corps bus at or near Dayton, Ohio, on August 18, 1943; *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", insert "and loss of earnings."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LT. COL. ORVILLE E. MCKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### MRS. MARY JANE SHERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 704) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### THERESE R. COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 925) for the relief of Therese R. Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Therese R. Cohen, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Therese R. Cohen, resulting from her being thrown from a United States Navy truck on April 14, 1944, on the grounds of the Floyd Bennett Naval Air Station, Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000", and insert "\$3,304."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### D. LANE POWERS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1093) for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the



sum of \$992.90 to D. Lane Powers, to pay the sum of \$4,337.12 to Elaine Powers Taylor, and to pay the sum of \$500 to Monroe W. Taylor, all of Trenton, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle along a highway in East Windsor Township, Mercer County, N. J., on June 10, 1945. Said vehicle at the time of the accident being controlled and operated by an employee of the Government who was not acting within the scope of his office or employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning with line 3, strike out the balance of the page down to and including the word "employment" on page 2, line 7, and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$552 to D. Lane Powers, of Trenton, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by him as a result of a collision between his automobile and an Army vehicle parked at night without lights on State Highway Numbered 33 in East Windsor Township, Mercer County, N. J., on June 10, 1945, and to Elaine Powers Taylor, of Trenton, N. J., the sum of \$2,117, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, pain and suffering and disfigurement sustained, and medical and hospital expenses incurred as a result of said accident: *Provided*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA BILOBRAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1221) for the relief of Eva Bilobran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Eva Bilobran, 940 South Bouldin Street, Baltimore, Md., the sum of \$7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries suffered as a result of having been struck by a United States mail truck at the intersection of East Avenue and Dillon Street, Baltimore, Md., on December 14, 1943, and for medical services, hospital bills, and loss of salary during her illness: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$10,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$1,646."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GILDA COWAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1482) for the relief of Gilda Cowan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gilda Cowan the sum of \$10,000, as compensation for and in full settlement of all claims for damages against the United States for injuries sustained by her when, on April 28, 1934, a Navy Department trailer attached to the dirigible Macon, at Opa Locka Flying Field, Miami, Fla., ran over her right leg: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$1,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW CHIARODO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 241, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Andrew Chiarodo is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to \$597.50 here-

tofore paid to him as a plasterer at the United States naval air station, Anacostia, District of Columbia, for the period from February 26, 1945, to March 17, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States the said Andrew Chiarodo shall be considered to have been in the employ of the said air station at the rate of \$1.39 per hour during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Andrew Chiarodo as compensation for such period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN M. LORRAINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1510) for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 243, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness to the United States of Lillian M. Lorraine, and the said Lillian M. Lorraine is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to \$1,794 heretofore paid to her as a stenographer and clerk in the office of the paymaster, United States Marine Corps, Philadelphia, Pa., for the period from January 1, 1931, to April 6, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, the said Lillian M. Lorraine shall be considered to have been employed in said office at the rate of \$2.160 per annum from January 1, 1931, to June 30, 1945, inclusive, and at the rate of \$2.496 per annum from July 1, 1945, to April 6, 1946, inclusive, during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Lillian M. Lorraine as compensation for such period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Col. T. H. Chambers, Finance Department (now retired), \$43.73; Col. R. D. Daugherty, Finance Department,

\$22.53; Col. Maxton H. Flint, Finance Department, \$37.65; Col. L. P. Worrall, Finance Department (now retired), \$594.60, the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, as listed in letter, of the Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in determining amounts due individuals.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. D. F. Boichot, Finance Department, the sum of \$200, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing two counterfeit \$100 Federal Reserve notes received by him in the course of business: *Provided*, That the sum of \$200 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 3. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. C. R. Orem, Jr., Finance Department, the sum of \$50.44, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing four counterfeit French franc notes received by him in the course of business: *Provided*, That the sum of \$50.44 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 4. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. Shirley N. Black, Finance Department, the sum of \$30.26, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing three counterfeit French franc notes received by him in the course of business: *Provided*, That the sum of \$30.26 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 5. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. Jesse P. Bellamy, Finance Department, the sum of \$97.10, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing German mark notes received by him in the course of business and later determined to be unacceptable as legal tender: *Provided*, That the sum of \$97.10 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 6. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. L. H. Van Horne, Finance Department, the sum of \$1,917.34, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing the value of three counterfeit French franc notes received by him in the course of business, and five guilder notes which were unacceptable as legal tender: *Provided*, That the sum of \$1,917.34 shall be considered and accounted for as a charge against the appropriation "Finance Service, Army" current on the date of the enactment hereof.

SEC. 7. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Capt. Elton Hall, Jr., Finance Department, the sum of \$72.15, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him to an imposter representing himself to be an officer of the United States Army.

SEC. 8. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. W. M. Dixon, Finance Department (now retired), the sum of \$10.30, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him for newspaper ad-

vertising for and in behalf of the United States, said advertising having been published without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for said sum of \$10.30 or any part thereof.

SEC. 9. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Maj. Arthur Willink, Ordnance Department (now retired), the sum of \$26.49, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum has been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States on account of failure to purchase from a contractor listed in the General Schedule of Supplies: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payment.

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga., \$93.65; to the Greensboro News Co., Greensboro, N. C., \$28.83; and to the Raleigh Times, Raleigh, N. C., \$13.48, which amounts are due to the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no persons shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Louis C. Simon, Jr., Air Corps, the amount of \$200, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage in pay-roll funds delivered to him.

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. J. F. Stone, Finance Department, the amount of \$42.77, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed in the course of conversion of large amounts of French currency.

SEC. 13. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. A. W. Glienke, Finance Department, the amount of \$20.17, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed when a counterfeit 5-pound note was discovered among English currency accepted by him.

SEC. 14. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Elton Hall, Jr., Finance Department, the amount of \$201.75, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed when a counterfeit 50-pound note was discovered among English currency accepted by him.

SEC. 15. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Julius A. Stern, Air Corps, the amount of \$1,059.85, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which was later ascertained to be the result of a theft of the funds by another person.

SEC. 16. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Oliver H. Hunter, Jr., Finance Department, the amount of \$20.18, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage which developed when two counterfeit 500-franc notes were discovered among French currency accepted by him.

SEC. 17. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Walter S. Barnes, Air Corps, the amount of \$895.45, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount which was supplied by him from personal funds to cover a shortage resulting from the theft by some person unknown.

SEC. 18. Any amounts which otherwise may have been due any of the disbursing officers mentioned herein, or, in the case of deceased officers, may have been due their heirs, for any other purpose, and which amounts or any part thereof have been used as a set-off by the Comptroller General to clear disallowances in said officers' accounts mentioned herein, shall be refunded to such disbursing officers or their heirs: *Provided*, That any amounts refunded by any of said disbursing officers, or their heirs, to the United States on account of said disallowances, shall also be refunded to such disbursing officers or their heirs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after "letter of", insert "January 8, 1947."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, the War Department has requested that an amendment be offered to this bill in view of the fact that this particular claimant is not entitled to the sums set forth in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 20, strike out line 20 through line 3 on page 8.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. THEODORE A. GEISSMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Theodore A. Geissman, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Dr. Geissman against the United States arising out of personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained by him in April 1944 as a result of an explosion in a laboratory of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., during OSRD project OEMsr-934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person vio-



lating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$8,500 to Harriet Townsend Bottomley, in full and final settlement for damages to her home grounds and property at Old Brookville (Glen Head Post Office) Nassau County, N. Y., growing out of the crash of a naval airplane on May 28, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$8,500" and insert "\$7,790."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "settlement", insert "of all claims against the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HENRY BIG DAY ET AL.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 39, the bill (H. R. 2199) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, namely, Jennie Smart Enemy; Miles Fighter; Mrs. Foolish Bear; Medicine Crow; Naomi Foolish Bear; Twin Woman; Frank He Does It; Michael Big Hair; Peter Big Hair; Harriett Little Owl; Josephine Big Hair; Jacob C. Big Hair; Mary Big Hair; Paul Hill; Velma Big Hair; Karen Big Hair; Dennis Big Hair; Aloysius Big Hair; Jacob M. Big Hair;

Michael Big Hair; Peter Big Hair; Agnes Shaffer Big Hair; Velma Big Hair; Dennis Big Hair; Karen Big Hair; Aloysius Big Hair, Jr.; Jacob Big Hair; Jacob Charles Big Hair; Harriet Big Hair; Josephine Big Hair; and Mary Big Hair, a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted Catherine Shield Chief, allotment numbered 236, on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The west half of the northwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 14, township 3 south, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 120 acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MARY JANE SHERMAN

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 47, the bill (H. R. 704) for the relief of Mar. Jane Sherman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Jane Sherman, of Northbrook, Ill., the sum of \$35,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Jane Sherman against the United States for personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained as a result of a collision on May 18, 1943, involving the automobile she was driving, a tractor and trailer owned by the Kool Rite Sales Co., Chicago, Ill., and a United States Army truck, at the intersection of Waukegan Road and Shermer Avenue, Northbrook, Ill.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$6,203.20; to pay W. D. Sherman the sum of \$311.11."

Line 9, after "Sherman", insert "and W. D. Sherman."

Line 10, after "expenses", insert "and property damage."

Page 2, line 2, after "involving", strike out "the automobile she was driving, a tractor and trailer owned by the Kool Rite Sale Co., Chicago, Ill."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LOYALTY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems confronting our country today is the extent to which employees who are disloyal to our Government remain on the Federal pay roll. I had hoped that the recent Executive order upon this subject would solve the problem, but it does not do it.

The principal weakness of this Executive order is that it does not place upon any single person, department, or agency the affirmative responsibility of seeing to it that disloyal employees are removed from the Federal pay roll. Under the provisions of the Executive order the head of each department and agency is responsible for discharging disloyal employees in his agency. It is this very situation, combined with the failure of the Civil Service Commission to take affirmative action, which existed during the war and resulted in the employment of persons whose loyalties have been seriously questioned and who still remain on our Federal pay roll.

Because of the failure of the executive branch to take proper action with respect to this serious matter, I have today introduced legislation which in my judgment should be acted upon promptly. As I view it, the situation is of such serious nature that immediate legislative action is necessary. It is our duty to rid the Federal pay roll of subversive and disloyal persons who are in strategic places in our Government.

The main provisions of the bill I have introduced are as follows:

First. All Federal employees and applicants for Federal positions shall be subject to a loyalty investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; second, a loyalty review board composed of five members is created as a part of the Civil Service Commission and will review investigations conducted by the FBI; third, the Board shall make findings and decisions which shall be final, and if the Board finds that the person investigated is disloyal to our Government the head of the department or agency involved shall either not employ the person, or if employed, he shall be discharged; and, fourth, the standards which the Board shall use as a basis for the refusal of employment or for the removal from employment shall be that, on all of the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person investigated is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

The bill also contains provisions giving affected employees and applicants the right of appeal, and affords them every opportunity to present evidence showing their loyalty to the Government of the United States.

I am convinced that the solution to this problem lies with the Congress in providing adequate legislation under which the executive branch can discharge disloyal employees, since it is clear that the executive branch is reluctant to assume this responsibility on its own initiative.

In this atomic age when the very existence of our country might well depend

upon a single employee who might reveal extremely secret and confidential information it occurs to me that we cannot take our responsibility lightly. We must provide adequate safeguards for the security of our Nation.

I am opposed to "Red baiting" and "witch hunting," but I do believe there is a reasonable approach which recognizes that the security of our Nation depends in large measure upon the loyalty of each Federal employee.

I am convinced that the vast majority of the Federal employees are loyal to our Government beyond any question of doubt, and I am certain too these loyal Americans will welcome an investigation of their loyalty since such investigations will protect their Government from being destroyed by subversive employees.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at the point of the passage of the bill H. R. 1844 a letter written to the Speaker by General Bradley asking for its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Plain Dealer.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the National Bakers Supply House Association to the President of the United States.

#### AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a resolution adopted by the British Cooperative Party attacking President Truman for having recommended aid to Greece and Turkey, and anonymously circularized among Members of Congress by someone in New York, nauseates me. This resolution shows two things:

First. What craven cowards communism has made of a segment of a once proud people who did not quake when living under the muzzles of German guns, and,

Second. Communism must be routed out of England as well as every other part of the world if liberty is not to perish from the face of the earth.

The President's proposal will come to the floor of this House for consideration in a few days, and while I support the proposal, there are many of us that are anxious to know what, if anything, is being done toward making good the promise of the President to put pro-Russians out of the Government.

A statement allegedly made by the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission several days ago was not encouraging. I am wondering if we are going to be compelled to entirely depend on legislative outlawing, communism in this country.

This is the resolution to which I have referred:

#### BRITISH CO-OPS CALL UNITED STATES POLICY MENACE

LLANDUDNO, WALES, April 8.—The Cooperative Party, which usually reflects the opinion of non-trade-union rank and file in the Labor Party, has passed a resolution condemning President Truman's proposed aid to Greece and Turkey as a "menace to world peace."

The resolution was passed by the party's annual conference yesterday despite objection by its own national executive that such an attitude would hinder Foreign Secretary Bevin at the Moscow Conference. The resolution said:

"This conference is firmly of the opinion that the method of the proposed American aid to Greece and Turkey constitutes a menace to world peace and a negation of the democratic principles for the preservation of which the grave sacrifices of the last war were made.

"Further, the conference insists that this attempt to bypass the United Nations organization will seriously impair the authority of the organization and destroy the confidence and hopes of free peoples everywhere.

"President Truman has betrayed the trust that history has placed in his hands and has been guilty of a piece of statesmanship without parallel in its irresponsibility in the postwar world."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I said on the floor the other day, if the administration is going to make this a full-dress affair and drive communism from every department of this Government, from our educational institutions, from the moving-picture industry, and off the radio, save America for Americans, save our Christian civilization and the American way of life, we will go along with it; but if we are merely going to adopt a soup-kitchen diplomacy, we had better think twice.

Mr. COX. I, of course, agree with the gentleman. I trust that the matter is not going to rest with the simple words of the President but that something is going to be done by the people in the Government, who operate under the President's orders.

#### DISLOYAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on March 24 I introduced a bill in the House to comply with Presidential Executive Order No. 9835, which sought to rid our Government of subversive employees. This bill will revoke the United States citizenship of all former aliens and it directs the Department of Justice to deport all those naturalized citizens found guilty of being disloyal and subversive to our American way of life. It instructs the Attorney General to deport also all aliens and persons whom he believes, or has reason to believe, will endanger the public safety or welfare of our country. Due to some recent developments, and in order to make my bill complete in every respect, I have redrafted it and am

reintroducing it today. I sincerely believe that in its present form that it covers the situation thoroughly and will rid our country of these dangerous termites.

I think that during World War I Irving Berlin hit the nail on the head when he wrote this little song. If my memory serves me correctly, it goes this way—

If you don't like your Uncle Sammy, then go back to your home o'er the sea—To the land from whence you came, whatever be its name.

But don't be ungrateful to me.

If you don't like the stars in Old Glory, if you don't like the red, white, and blue,

Then don't act like the cur in the story.

Don't bite the hand that's feeding you.

I hope the House will support this bill when it comes out of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### COMMEMORATION OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, April 10, 1847, in the little community of Mako in Hungary a great American was born.

A century later the name of Joseph Pulitzer shines with as much luster as that of any of those who have made America great—with the names of all those through whose efforts our land was handed down from generation to generation as the "home of the free."

Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and the others fought to give future generations of Americans a land in which their freedom and liberty would be forever sacred. Men like Joseph Pulitzer carried on the fight in another way, a fight which must be never ending, if the truths which our founding fathers held "to be self-evident" are to prevail.

How often have we heard the expression that it is time for our country to get back to normal? Those who ask for such a course are not imbued with the fire and zeal of the men who founded a strong Nation—nor with the progressive energy of the men like Joseph Pulitzer who encouraged their fellow Americans to go forward to great achievements. America is a land that lives in progress—every step must be forward. To clear thinkers and great leaders there is no normalcy except stagnation which in due time would sap the strength from our national life.

Many journalists have played important roles in the building of America. None has played a greater part than this immigrant son of Old World parents. His entire life as a newspaper publisher was dedicated to the service of the people, and in serving the people he contributed in no small measure to the national welfare.

Joseph Pulitzer's idea of how to best serve the people is given in the platform which he promulgated for his St. Louis Post-Dispatch on his retirement April 10, 1907, his sixtieth birthday. In a few words he set forth his credo, as follows:

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform,



never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogues of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent; never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

This platform of the Post-Dispatch is now printed daily as the masthead on the editorial page. Under the policy set down in Joseph Pulitzer's legacy to those who followed him in the direction of this great daily newspaper, the Post-Dispatch has fought corruption in local government, supported numerous programs in the interest of civil improvements, and, most of all, has fulfilled Mr. Pulitzer's belief that the press should exercise its power to mold public opinion to "make for justice in government, for purity in politics, and for a higher morality in the business and social life of the Nation."

The whole press of the United States has been the better for the combination of integrity and idealism which Joseph Pulitzer brought into the newspaper world with him. Few men who have been prominent in journalism during the last century are more worthy of honor than Pulitzer, and it was fitting that the Government of the United States should recognize this fact.

The Post Office Department has issued a 3-cent commemorative stamp to be released for issue today. Only one other journalist in the history of this Nation has been so honored, Benjamin Franklin.

And it may be noted here that the honor went to Franklin in tribute to his endeavors in the fields of diplomacy and politics rather than because of his journalistic activities. Actually, the Pulitzer commemorative stamp is the first newspaper stamp in the history of the United States postal service.

The Statue of Liberty appears in the design because Joseph Pulitzer, the immigrant boy who enlisted in the Union Army in the Civil War within a month after his arrival in this country, raised the money for the pedestal on which the Goddess of Freedom stands in New York Harbor. Appeals to Congress and other sources had failed before Joseph Pulitzer began a campaign through his New York World to raise \$100,000 for the purpose.

The pedestal incident gave a good insight into the character of Joseph Pulitzer, revealing his deep gratitude to his adopted country for the opportunities it had afforded him. The French nation had given the Statue of Liberty to the American people and our Government has set aside space for it on Bedloe Island, but efforts to raise funds to construct a base had failed.

Mr. Pulitzer remembered how he, as a boy of 17 entering Boston harbor, had looked eagerly for the land of promise to rise upon the horizon. Liberty's statue, he determined, would be the future beacon of welcome to immigrant boys.

A quotation which appears on the stamp fits well into the motive of any tribute paid to Joseph Pulitzer: "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together."

Joseph Pulitzer did all within his power to make certain that both would rise.

In New York today there will be a commemorative observance at Columbia University, where Mr. Pulitzer endowed the School of Journalism. Mr. Pulitzer was not only a crusader through his newspapers but he was a public-spirited citizen who was a benefactor of many worth while movements.

Mr. Pulitzer died on October 29, 1911, aboard his yacht *Liberty*, Charleston Harbor, S. C. Announcement of bequests under his will included \$2,000,000 for the Pulitzer School of Journalism; \$500,000 for the now world-famous Pulitzer prizes in journalism and literature; \$1,000,000 for the Philharmonic Symphony of New York, and \$1,000,000 for the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Add to these memorials the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York World, in its day, as splendid monuments to him.

Like so many foreign born who chose America as their home, Joseph Pulitzer had a deep appreciation of what it meant to be an American citizen. In his enlistment in the Union Army, almost as soon as he set foot on American shore, he quickly pledged an undying allegiance to his adopted country and from that moment never ceased to be a credit to it.

When I hear some men in public positions speak disparagingly of our foreign-born citizens—and the occasion is all too frequent—I think of the contributions men like Joseph Pulitzer have made to our American way of life, in contrast to the feeble contribution of the bigots and narrow minds who bask in the glory of a distant forebear who happened to secure passage on the *Mayflower*.

Some of our superpatriots are quick to yell "foreigner" when the name of any foreign-born person is discussed. But let them remember that the *Mayflower* was a mighty small boat and some mighty fine people had to take a later boat. How could even a descendant of a *Mayflower* passenger surpass in Americanism the thousands upon thousands of foreign-born who now are American citizens and who have contributed on occasion after occasion to make this the greatest Nation on earth?

Joseph Pulitzer is only one example of an immigrant boy who believed in America—who gave as much to his adopted country as he received from it.

The career of Joseph Pulitzer was amazing. While it is true that Pulitzer arrived in St. Louis in October 1865, as a penniless, mustered-out Union soldier from New York, his birth in far-off Hungary 18 years before had not been in the environment which would qualify him as a Horatio Alger rags-to-riches hero. He came from a family of more than comfortable circumstances and was educated in private schools so that when he arrived in America he was not the usual uneducated type of immigrant. But his education was all that remained with him as he started life in a new land.

As a boy he left home when his mother remarried some time after the death of his father. Because of slender physique he failed in his effort to get into

the Austrian Army. In Hamburg he talked to a United States recruiting officer and soon was on his way to America.

After the war he returned to New York where efforts to secure employment failed. The story is told how the threadbare youth in his worn uniform hung around City Hall Park and was asked by the porter of French's Hotel in Park Row to stop having his shoes polished there—the site he afterward bought for the World Building.

On October 10, 1865, young Pulitzer reached East St. Louis. He had headed West on the advice of a practical joker who told him he could learn English better in St. Louis because there he would hear only English spoken. He worked his way across the Mississippi River on a Wiggins ferryboat.

But from here on Joseph Pulitzer was on his way. It was not an easy road and he did not look for any short cuts. He worked as a mule hostler, waiter, roustabout, stevedore, hack driver, and on other lowly jobs. His newspaper career began in 1868 the year following his naturalization as an American citizen, when he became a reporter on the German-language *Westliche Post*. Three years later, after being elected to the Missouri State Legislature, he became part-owner of the *Westliche Post*.

That was his real start as a great publisher. In 1874 he bought the bankrupt St. Louis *Staats-Zeitung* and sold its Associated Press franchise. But he did not continue immediately in the journalistic field. Before finally convincing himself that his only career was a career as a journalist he was active in politics and in 1876 he was admitted to the bar in Washington, D. C.

On December 9, 1878, he bought the St. Louis Dispatch for \$2,500 at a sheriff's sale on the steps of the courthouse. Harold Stanley Pollard, Mr. Pulitzer's last literary secretary, wrote:

The next 5 years showed St. Louis and Missouri what kind of newspaper his was. Never in the history of the country had any paper put itself so close to the people of a community, understood so well their thoughts and needs, fought their battles so vigorously, pursued their enemies so relentlessly. The early annals of the Post-Dispatch read like the annals of another Seven Years' War.

The St. Louis Post and Dispatch, as such, was created 2 days after the purchase of the Dispatch through a merger of the new Pulitzer-owned Dispatch and the Post, then owned by John A. Dillon, and on March 10, 1879, the name was changed to the Post-Dispatch.

From that beginning the St. Louis Post-Dispatch went on to become one of the Nation's greatest newspapers. Still Pulitzer-owned it carried on in the Pulitzer way, ever crusading in the interest of the public welfare—always a guardian of the public interest, progressive in its policies and fearless in its action. No newspaper has been more vigorous in its defense of the public. None can point to a longer list of achievements in the interest of the public.

The first issue of the Post and Dispatch bore Joseph Pulitzer's declaration

of purpose which remained the guiding policy of his newspaper thereafter:

The Post and Dispatch will serve no party—

He wrote in that initial publication after the merger—

will be no organ but the organ of truth, will follow no caucuses but its own convictions, will not support the administration but criticize it, will oppose all frauds and shams, wherever and whatever they are, will advocate principles and ideas rather than prejudice and partisanship. These ideas and principles are precisely the same as those on which our Government was originally founded. They are the ideas of true, genuine, real democracy. They are the doctrines of hard money, home rule, and revenue reform.

On the second day the Post and Dispatch went further with a declaration of complete independence in politics:

If Democracy means assent to the management of the State treasury, we are not Democratic. If Republicanism is formulated by Blaine, we are not Republican.

Pulitzer's new paper urged the politicians to "give us honest elections, an income tax, a reformed civil service, a reformed tariff."

Instead of the bloody shirt—

Pulitzer wrote—

improve the Mississippi, build another road to the Pacific, open Indian territory, restore our American merchant marine.

Seems we are always crying for a restoration of our merchant marine. We could be giving some serious thought to the matter now. America is, has always been and probably always will be a generous nation, but in the giving away of merchant ships to competing-trade nations, or selling them at ridiculously low prices, we would do well to be cautious. In the not too far distant future we are likely to see many of the vessels released by us for the rehabilitation of the commerce of others sailing the seas in competition with American shipping.

Like Pulitzer over 80 years ago it might be wise now to consider the future of our merchant marine before we cripple it too greatly and sink it to the low pre-war level. We have the tonnage now—but to hold it we must keep strings even on the ships we may find it necessary to loan to foreign nations in time of their need.

Mr. Pollard, in telling of Joseph Pulitzer's purchase of the New York World in 1883, says he made it a newspaper that doubled its purchase price in annual earnings after 3 years because of three things which Mr. Pulitzer learned in St. Louis: First, the responsiveness of the people to a paper that fought their battles openly, honestly, untiringly; second, the prosperity such a newspaper could count on; third, the power of independence in politics.

Joseph Pulitzer, an immigrant boy who could not speak too much English until well after his eighteenth birthday, undoubtedly contributed more to American journalism than any other person. Without question he was the first to show the press which had been granted so much freedom by our Constitution that it owed its greatest responsibility to the

people of the Nation who had insisted upon the guaranty of the freedom of the press.

Joseph Pulitzer was the father of modern journalism. America honors this typically American's memory today.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether all of the Members received the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch such as the one which comes to my desk about three times a week?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I was informed by a member of the editorial staff of the Post-Dispatch that a special supplementary issue was being sent to every Member of Congress.

Mr. HAYS. I wish to thank the gentleman for his comments and join with him in the tribute which he has paid to Mr. Pulitzer and the Post-Dispatch. In my judgment this editorial page is one of the most stimulating sheets in America and I think the service rendered in making available their statements along with their cartoons by their brilliant cartoonist, Mr. Fitzpatrick, is an excellent one.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### UTAH, THE FRIENDLY STATE

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this year, a sturdy band of Mormon pioneers entered the Great Salt Lake Valley. Brigham Young, their leader, had envisioned the spot they were seeking many months before. On July 24, 1847, they reached the summit overlooking the Great Salt Lake Basin. Young rose in his carriage to view the valley below and said, "This is the place." To less hardy individuals this desolate expanse of sagebrush, bordered on the west by a sea of salt, could hardly be termed a paradise. Those who visit the same spot today will agree that "this is the place," for the desert has been made to blossom as a rose. Countless visitors to this paradise of the West have termed Utah "The Friendly State." We are proud of this designation and intend to demonstrate to Utah visitors during this centennial year that ours is truly "The Friendly State."

This commendable characteristic is not of recent origin. From the dawn of the white man's history in Utah friendliness has been a practiced virtue. Escalante, with his Spanish missionaries on what may be called a "good will" tour, spent the summer and fall of 1776 in the valleys and mountains of Utah visiting with the Ute Indians on very friendly terms. Fur trappers and traders, the pathfinders of the West, led by such men as Jedediah S. Smith, Jim Bridger, Etienne Provot, Peter Skene Ogden, and William Ashley, then entered this primitive area, one of America's last frontiers. In general their relationship with the red men was friendly. Government explorers, Fremont, Boone-

ville, Stansbury, and others followed. Their relationship with the Utahans as a whole was friendly. The Indians themselves may at times have scalped some of their enemies, but they didn't skin their friends, like some whites do today.

The motto of Brigham Young was: "Feed the Indians rather than fight them." The building of an inland empire from a desert wasteland was only accomplished by a friendly, cooperative, brotherly attitude. As the forty-niners marched westward to the California gold fields the Mormon settlements in Utah were like an oasis in the desert and served as a base of supplies. It was a friendly lift that carried them on to their destination. Since 1847 the leaders and citizens of this thriving Commonwealth have extended a friendly hand to all who have visited the beehive State.

Utah's 100 years will be observed with a full schedule of events that does honor to the pioneers who carved out the destiny of the State and intermountain empire. Major events throughout the State include parades, pageants, exhibits, an air show, auto races, sports, fairs, concerts, operas, dramas, musical, and dance festivals. It may be of interest to enumerate some of these outstanding events: The official centennial opening is the pioneer program to be held in the world-famous Salt Lake Tabernacle May 1, where about 200 living Utah pioneers who came to Utah before 1869 are to be honored.

From May 3 until June 15 the Library of Congress will feature a Utah centennial exhibit.

The pageant, Message of the Ages, featuring 600 performers, will be held in the Salt Lake Tabernacle May 5 to June 6.

A giant centennial exposition on the Utah State Fairgrounds will be a beehive of activity from June 2 to September 20.

The national collegiate track and field meet will be held in Salt Lake City June 20. This will serve as the try-outs for the Olympics of 1948.

On July 15, 72 canvas-covered cars will leave Nauvoo, Ill., in a caravan commemorating the Mormon trek. They will travel westward over the Mormon Trail and arrive in Salt Lake City July 22, the day the advance company arrived 100 years ago.

Two mammoth parades are being staged on July 23 and 24 in Salt Lake City.

The United States Post Office Department has promised a centennial commemorative stamp to be issued on July 24. Appropriate ceremonies are planned to be held at the Salt Lake post office that day.

September 1 has been set for a 500-mile auto race at the Bonneville salt flats. Also, an attempt will be made to break John Cobb's world record for the measured mile made on these flats several years ago.

A brilliant air show is being planned through the cooperation of the National Aeronautics Association in Salt Lake City. The date has not yet been announced.



This is Utah's centennial year. A friendly invitation to visit "the friendly State" is extended in a friendly way.

#### SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for this afternoon be vacated and that it be transferred to Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Miami Herald.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by C. N. Woods, former regional forester, USFS.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and to include my letter to the Thirty-first Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE ON LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are now at the crossroads in this country when we have a labor bill being brought up within the near future on the floor of the House of Representatives which will change fundamentally the relationships between labor and management in this country. Because of that crossroads I am stopping to call attention to the fact that here is a Congressman that is going to listen to his district and the voters in the district on what to do. I am sending out a questionnaire to 60,000 separate registered voters in the Thirty-first District of Pennsylvania this week. I am enclosing that questionnaire in the RECORD so that they can see what the questions are and tell me how they want me to vote, as their Congressman from the southern district of Pittsburgh.

The questionnaire reads as follows:

APRIL 1947.

#### To My Friends:

Here is your opportunity to tell your Congressman how to vote; what to do in regard to your job, your rights, and your duties. We are at a crossroads in this country. It's your future, so what do you want? Tell me; I'm open-minded.

Your Congressman,

JIM FULTON.

Do you want your Congressman to (oppose—favor) passage of a labor bill now? Are you satisfied with United States labor-management law as it is now? Yes. No. Should there be (less—more) United States controls on (labor—management—both)? Shall we continue—

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| (1) Closed shop (must be a union member to be hired).....                                       | ----- |
| (2) Union shop (hired without being union member but must join after short try-out period)..... | ----- |
| (3) Check-off (employer collects union dues by deducting from member's pay).....                | ----- |
| Shall we permit—  |       |
| (1) Industry-wide strikes on a national scale.....  | ----- |
| (2) Strikes by law only in local plants.....  | ----- |
| (3) Government employees generally to strike.....   | ----- |

Do you favor (1) present power to strike or (2) compulsory arbitration for—

- |   |       |         |
|---|-------|---------|
| (a) Public-utility employees.....                         | ----- | (1) (2) |
| (b) Public-school teachers.....                           | ----- |         |
| (c) Basic industries:                                     |       |         |
| Automobiles.....  | ----- |         |
| Electrical products.....                                  | ----- |         |
| Coal.....   | ----- |         |
| Steel.....  | ----- |         |
| Manufactured products of steel-fabricating companies..... | ----- |         |

Shall your Congressman vote for a bill to outlaw—

- |  |       |        |
|--|-------|--------|
| (1) Jurisdictional strikes.....  | ----- | Yes No |
| (2) Sympathy strikes.....  | ----- |        |
| (3) Secondary boycotts.....  | ----- |        |
| (4) Picketing of homes.....  | ----- |        |
| Should the proposed bill require before strike—                        |       |        |
| (1) 30-day notice.....   | ----- |        |
| (2) Secret vote of union.....  | ----- |        |
| (3) 50-percent favorable strike vote by majority of union members..... | ----- |        |

Name .....  
Address .....  
Union member .....

This is your own personal crossroad. Your views are important as the vote in Congress on these issues will be close.

Mail to me at Washington, D. C.  
Congressman JAMES G. FULTON.

#### FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDERSEN, JOHNSON of Illinois, FLANNAGAN, and COOLEY.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. RUSSELL]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts and editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

#### THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

##### FRANKLY SPEAKING

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the heart of the present debate on the foreign policy of the United States, frankly speaking, is to be found in the relations between the United States and Soviet Russia. In the consideration of this question we must not be blinded by extraneous matters and collateral issues. I propose to speak as clearly as I know how and with utter and complete frankness. The current critical world situation has resulted from an unwillingness on the part of Communist-controlled Russia to live up to agreements solemnly made plus a desire on the part of Moscow to take advantage of the post-war world dislocation for the express purpose of achieving a world dominated by communism. The world crisis will be resolved when the United States comes to grips with the realities of the situation and makes a determined stand against Soviet aggression and the advance of communism.

##### RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The political and strategic aspects of Russo-American relations are all-important. From observations made and information received by visiting over 30 countries in Europe, the Balkans, and the Middle East during the summer and fall of 1945, I have been forced to the inescapable conclusion that there are two basic principles in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The first principle is expansion—since 1939 Russia has annexed 273,947 square miles of territory, an area more than four times that of the New England States, with an aggregate population of 24,355,000. In addition to this, 12 nations with a total population of 165,000,000 have been forced under Russian domination through Soviet-controlled governments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does that include the part of Korea that Russia presently controls?

Mr. MERROW. Yes, that includes part of Korea.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe. Can the gentleman tell the House what arrangements have been made and when the arrangements were entered into for Russia to occupy part of Korea?

Mr. MERROW. I cannot.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does anyone know? Does the State Department know whether it was a secret agreement entered into at Yalta or Potsdam, or where it was entered into?

Mr. MERROW. I presume the State Department knows.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has not been made public, as I understand.

Mr. MERROW. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would it be possible for the committee to question the State Department and perhaps get some information as to when the agreement was reached on Korea?

Mr. MERROW. I think it would be possible, and I would be very glad to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It would be interesting to know.

Mr. MERROW. According to William Henry Chamberlin in an article which appeared in the American Mercury, May 1946, the lands annexed since September 1939 are:

	Area in square miles	Population
Eastern Poland.....	68,260	10,150,000
Finnish Karelia.....	16,173	470,000
Lithuania.....	24,058	3,029,000
Latvia.....	20,056	1,950,000
Estonia.....	18,253	1,120,000
Bessarabia and Bukovina.....	19,360	3,748,000
Moldavia.....	13,124	2,200,000
Petsamo.....	4,087	4,000
Koenigsberg area of East Prussia.....	3,500	400,000
Carpatho-Ukraine.....	4,922	800,000
South Sakhalin.....	14,075	415,000
Kurile Islands.....	3,949	4,500
Tannu Tuva.....	64,000	64,000
Total.....	273,947	24,354,500

The territories over which Moscow has extended domination by puppet governments and Communist influence include:

	Millions of inhabitants
Poland.....	20 to 25
Czechoslovakia.....	12 to 15
Hungary.....	9 to 10
Austria.....	3.5
Yugoslavia.....	14 to 16
Bulgaria.....	6 to 7
Rumania.....	13
Eastern Germany.....	25
Finland.....	4
Manchuria.....	40
North Korea.....	10
Outer Mongolia.....	1

The second principle underlying Russian foreign policy is to spread communism whenever and wherever possible. In 1945 I was with a congressional committee in Ankara and Istanbul. The Turks expressed great fear that their powerful neighbor to the north would move on them in an effort to take the Dardanelles. Constantine Brown, in a dispatch from Istanbul which appeared in the Sunday Star, published in Washington on April 6, stated:

Yet Turkey's financial position is shaky because the bulk of the national income has to be spent on military preparations. The Turkish Prime Minister told this correspondent that if it had not been for this precaution, the Russians would have entered Turkey last summer.

In Teheran many members of the Parliament informed us that the Soviet Union would ultimately try to annex that country in order to reach the oil of the Persian Gulf. In the Balkan states it is evident that free elections would turn out the Communist parties now in power.

The people cannot rid themselves of rulers who dominate them by force. From east to west and north to south there are active Communist parties. One has only to visit the countries in Europe, the Balkans, and the Middle East or to observe the activities of the Communist Party in the United States to be convinced that the spreading of communism to every country is a cardinal principle of the Moscow foreign policy.

In my opinion Mr. Stalin and his associates will not stop their program of aggressive expansion and of spreading communism until the United States takes a firm stand. I believe this is the time for a show-down. This is the time to make the position of the United States absolutely clear.

Mr. Chamberlin in his article to which I have previously referred concludes in the following words:

Russia's human and material losses in the war have been too great. Stalin is too well aware that Soviet technique in aviation and industrial production is inferior to America's. So far as we know he does not possess the atom bomb. Russian naval power is negligible. Besides, the Soviet Union needs time to digest the immense areas it has already swallowed. We must assume, therefore, that the current Soviet dynamism will stop short of a line where, in Stalin's judgment, America and Great Britain will fight rather than yield.

#### FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

On November 29, 1945, 16 months ago, I introduced a resolution providing for a select committee of 23 Members of the House to make a study of the foreign policy of the United States and to investigate the Department of State. I regret that the Seventy-ninth Congress did not act upon this resolution. Such a study would have been most helpful in developing a firm, realistic, and intelligent foreign policy to meet the exigencies of the present hour. Over a year ago, on January 22, 1946, I said on the floor of the House:

If I have gained anything in traveling in over 30 countries, if I have gained anything from being in London as a delegate to the Educational Conference, it is this: We must move immediately to see if we can develop a firm, realistic, objective foreign policy for the United States.

On January 3, 1947, I reintroduced my resolution, which was referred to the Rules Committee. Recent events have emphasized the importance of the study I propose. I am including my bill in the RECORD. It is as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) a comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world; such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan states, the Middle East, Central and South America, and so forth; and

(2) an investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States;

(3) methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) the communication of such information to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days; the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1949.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

There is now greater urgency for the adoption of my resolution than ever before. I shall continue to press for a complete and thorough study of the foreign policy of the United States, both economic and political. As the matter stands there are five committees of the House making attempts at studies and investigations of certain phases of the activities of the Department of State. They include Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Post Office and Civil Service, and Un-American Activities. One committee, and it ought to be a special committee, should be given full and complete power to study and report on the foreign policy of this country and to investigate the Department of State and the Foreign Service. We need only to review the events of the past few months and to point to the critical current world conditions to be convinced of the necessity of acting on the proposition I have set forth.

Such a committee as I have requested ought to be authorized at once to make a thorough investigation of our foreign policy both economic and political. By such procedure we would be able to determine with intelligence our course of action for the future. We need to secure an over-all world picture. Our interests are global and unless we have a wise foreign policy based on a most careful study of our interests around the world, we could well lose the position destiny has given to us as the leading nation of this earth in man's struggle to obtain a lasting peace.



Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am heartily in accord with the gentleman's idea on this resolution for an investigation. I am somewhat disturbed by the argument the gentleman has presented with reference to the spread of communism. Do I understand that it is your position that we proceed at once to stop communism in Greece and Turkey and then move into other areas where communism arises?

Mr. MERROW. That is my position. I think the issue is clearly drawn and we should speak very frankly about it. We should move into Greece and Turkey, and then if it is necessary, move into other areas to prevent this aggressive expansion and spread of communism throughout the world. I think that is our responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is a terrific responsibility, is it not?

Mr. MERROW. It is a tremendous responsibility but with world leadership comes tremendous responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That means there are possibilities of our moving into every country that is occupied today in Europe.

Mr. MERROW. I do not know how far our action will extend. A study of the type I have suggested would reveal it. The Middle East is at stake. Western Europe is at stake, and the Far East is at stake.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Can we embark on such a program?

Mr. MERROW. If we cannot, I hate to think of the alternative, which will be a Russian-dominated world. We must make up our minds to embark on a program to halt communism. Of course, I think if we call the bluff of the Soviet Union now we will avoid a lot of trouble in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I hope that is true, but I have grave doubts about it.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman advocate doing something to stop the encroachment of communism in our own country first?

Mr. MERROW. Simultaneously; yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I noticed in the press a day or so ago that we were committed to supply Korea with about \$600,000,000 to go in and stop communism. I also noted that when the British gave up India we have some commitments to go into India. I assume that is for the same purpose as we are now called to go into Greece and Turkey. Does the gentleman think we ought to go into France where the Communists have taken over or into Cuba, our own back door, where the Communists are having a fight with the government down there, or into Latin America, South America, and Central American countries where the Communists are very active?

Mr. MERROW. You have asked several questions. To help guarantee the security of the United States, I think we must do something in Korea. If it were not for the British and the Americans, I am confident that France would go communistic. Wherever there is danger of countries being taken over and subsequently being used against us, we must take a stand.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. How far would you go? Of course they say we are a wealthy country. Nobody knows how wealthy we are. We know what our debt is. We know we are going to have a day of reckoning sometime. The gentleman knows the way to stop communism is to fill them full of good food and keep them filled with good food. Of course, there is a limit to what we can do in that respect. Would the gentleman muster the young men of America to go into all of those countries and put on the fight that we have got to put on?

Mr. MERROW. I do not think it is necessary to muster the young men of America at the present time, but if we do not act now I am afraid of grave consequences in 15 or 20 years.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am profoundly impressed with the statement that the gentleman makes. If I understand him correctly it is that we should challenge communism wherever communism threatens our security.

Mr. MERROW. Exactly.

Mr. COX. Many embarrassing questions have been propounded to the gentleman, but to all of them he makes a direct and responsive answer, evidencing, in my judgment, a farsighted statesmanship on the part of the gentleman. I agree with the gentleman that the alternative would be too awful to even attempt to describe. As for sending the youth of our country, our young manhood, into other parts of the world to fight communism, I think an appropriate answer should be that all of the people of this country should give their all, whenever necessary, to save America.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his complimentary words and for the lucid way in which he has stated this issue. I wish we could have it so clearly stated that there would be no question in the mind of anybody as to the importance of this issue.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to express my interest in what the gentleman has to say. I would like to ask him, on the basis of information that he may have, just how well prepared the American Nation is to defend Americanism, not only here but all over the world. I ask this because 2 years ago when the war ended we represented the most powerful military nation in the world. In the meantime, of course, we have dis-

banded and dismantled many of our war plants. We have mustered out many of our soldiers, and there is no question but that we are not as well prepared today as we were 2 years ago. Can the gentleman enlighten me on that situation?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; I am coming to this in my speech.

I will say to the gentleman that I was in several theaters of warfare in 1945. I was exceedingly proud of the United States of America. We had the largest, the best-equipped, the best-clothed, and most efficient army in the world. We had the greatest air force, we had the greatest striking power ever developed by any nation; yet within a short period of time we, a nation of extremes, mind you, established the world's record for stripping ourselves of our armed strength, for scuttling our power, and demobilizing our armies. We are now in a much inferior position than in 1945. We should keep this in mind. We should be determined to maintain the strongest navy in the world, a powerful and efficient army, and above all things, maintain—and I have said this before on the floor of this House—air supremacy at all costs.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. One further question, if the gentleman will permit. Does the gentleman have any doubt, as a result of the painstaking work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, about the military strategy and preparedness of Russia and some of the other great powers?

Mr. MERROW. I have no detailed information on that question. That is a good question. We should have detailed information on the subject. I asked Secretary Patterson when he appeared before the committee the other day this question: Have you any idea as to the magnitude of the Soviet strength on the Turkish borders?

He said, "No," but it is considerable.

We have a pretty good idea of her land army, but I understand we do not have the information on her air-borne force, although it is said in some quarters that she has the largest air-borne force in the world.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. My reason for asking these questions of the gentleman is that I think Americanism is something which should command the admiration of the entire world. I think we have got to be in a position not only to defend it but to carry the principles of Americanism to the other parts of the world.

Mr. MERROW. May I say to the gentleman that I think the historians of the future will record our hasty demobilization and the rapid deterioration of our armed strength after World War II as one of the greatest tragedies that ever befell our Republic.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The same situation exists after World War II that existed after World War I in the matter of the depletion of the armed forces.

Has the gentleman ever figured out how many men it would take to carry out the foreign policy he feels we should have?

Mr. MERROW. I have not. I believe a thorough study of our foreign policy will give us some idea of what we need. We all know we need more strength than we have. We should keep it at a very high point. If we do this we probably will have not have to use it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that the Armed Services bill which was introduced recently and which gives such vast powers to the head of the Armed Services was introduced having in mind some such thing as this?

Mr. MERROW. I do not know.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That the reason such vast powers were given to one man by that bill was to face exactly the situation the gentleman presents?

Mr. MERROW. I do not know.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That bill fits exactly into the picture, does it not?

Mr. MERROW. I believe it does.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover states that there are more Communists per capita in the United States of America today than there were in Russia per capita at the time communism took over Russia. We have a Committee on Foreign Affairs that has the right to ask the State Department questions and to require them to give answers. The questions have been asked but they have not been answered. One of their oldest dodges of robbers and burglars when they want to burglarize a home is to cry, "Fire, Fire!" some place else, and while the homeowner is off fighting that fire the robbers burglarize his home.

Is there not the possibility that we have been hearing this cry of communism in the Middle East when there is more in this country than there was in Russia at the time the Communists took over? May not the Communists plunder us here while we are over there? We hear rumors of that. They say, "No answers, my dear Mr. Congressman."

Mr. MERROW. I believe we ought to have the information, but talking about Communists in this country does not answer the foreign situation. As I said before, we should proceed against communism at home and abroad simultaneously.

Mr. RAMEY. Why not do it here first?

Mr. MERROW. We should do it simultaneously. I thank the gentleman for his excellent observations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It is because of the high order of the gentleman's intellect and his understanding of this whole problem, which his remarks reflect, that I would like to identify myself as being on his side. As regards the State Department, I am not disposed to combat the argument advanced by many that up until

the latter days of the Byrnes occupancy of the office of Secretary of State that our policy as regard Russia was not intelligent, was not forthright, and was not honest; but since that time when it was found that Mr. Secretary Byrnes had come to a realization of what was going on, and on up until the present time when General Marshall, as head of the Department, is the gentleman prepared to agree that the State Department is making a somewhat better showing?

Mr. MERROW. I am. I agree with the gentleman, and I appreciate the comments that the gentleman has made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman sure that all of the Communists are out of the State Department?

Mr. MERROW. No; I am not. I have not made any assertion that they are in there. We have heard rumors to this effect, and that is why I would like an investigation to find out.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Following up the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] it has come to my notice that the activity of the Communist element in this country, in Detroit, for instance, under the name of the American Youth for Democracy, they were insolent enough the other day to notify the Governor of my State that they were operating in Detroit, for him not to waste the taxpayers' money, that they were going to continue to operate in spite of his investigation and threat to take them off the campus of our colleges and universities of learning in the State of Michigan.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I want to compliment him on the fine work he has been doing in combating communism in this country.

#### THE PROGRAM TO AID GREECE AND TURKEY

On Wednesday, March 12, 1947, President Truman asked the Congress for \$400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey. In his straightforward address, the President evidences a clear conception of our position as a responsible power in the world. He used these words:

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. . . .

. . . totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I wish to compliment and congratulate the President of the United States and the Department of State on the firm and realistic approach that has been made to the question of aiding Greece and Turkey. I am in complete accord with the program and have been ready to vote "yes" on the proposal ever since it was made. I made speeches calling for action in this crisis days before the delivery of the Presidential message. I

would go even further than President Truman suggests. I would extend aid to any country where it is necessary to halt the march of communism. If by appropriating the funds requested for aiding Greece and Turkey or by appropriating several times the amount asked for, should it become necessary, we can succeed in arresting the drive of Soviet communism and domination in the Mediterranean area, it will be money well invested.

#### FOREIGN POLICY IMPROVISED

For several years we have been improvising a foreign policy. In fact, as commendable as is the President's Greek and Turkish program, it is still an improvisation. It is designed to meet the present crisis. We must develop a long range foreign policy to prevent the repeated occurrence of crises. Many are asking, and rightly so, what are the future implications of our foreign policy? What are the limits of our ability to extend financial assistance to countries in danger of aggression and just where will such a course as we are embarking upon lead us? In an effort to provide the answers to some of these questions this House could make an invaluable contribution to the development of our foreign policy by immediately setting up the select committee for which I have asked. This committee will report every 90 days on matters of foreign policy, both economic and political, in relation to the various countries of the world. This House should have a greater voice in the formulation of foreign policy. A select committee empowered to study our relations with every country and empowered to investigate the Department of State would give us that voice. There are already four precedents in the Eightieth Congress for special committees. The Senate has created two select committees, namely, the Brewster Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business. The House has voted two select committees, the Select Committee on Small Business and the Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supplies. To implement the President's plan and to give this House a voice in developing an intelligent foreign policy designed to protect American interests, I believe that immediate action in establishing a special committee to do the things I have outlined in House Resolution 23 should immediately be created.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that it would be extremely valuable if the House also ratified treaties? I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as the House should be given a great deal more information regarding our foreign affairs, and it would be extremely valuable if they had a hand in the ratification of treaties.

Mr. MERROW. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And that the State Department should be obliged to do it.



Mr. MERROW. I am very glad the gentleman made that comment. Two years ago we sent an amendment to the Senate which would give the House a voice in treaty ratification. The amendment provided that treaties would be ratified by a majority of both Houses. I wish that the House would again pass such an amendment and send it to the Senate. Such an amendment will be adopted some time. I do not know how long it will take. This will give the House a voice in treaty ratification.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I am sorry to have missed the first part of the gentleman's speech. But, did the gentleman state his position in regard to Poland, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Estonia, and the other countries over which Russia now has domination? What would be the gentleman's action there? In other words, the gentleman seems to argue now that Russia has gone so far, "Thus far you shall go and no farther and we shall stop you with \$400,000,000." Personally, I think that is wishful thinking, and I do not agree with the gentleman at all in saying that this \$400,000,000 is going to stop Russia doing anything she wants to do in Europe. What is the gentleman's attitude in regard to Poland? What would the gentleman do there now, since Russia already has taken over?

Mr. MERROW. I introduced a resolution in the House several weeks ago stating that it is the sense of Congress that the whole Polish situation should be referred to the United Nations Assembly. I have often said that I think we should go even further and withdraw recognition from the present government in Poland. We should exercise in every possible way pressure to make the Soviet Union live up to agreements solemnly made. There have been violations of the Yalta agreement, the Potsdam agreement, the Atlantic Charter, and the charter of the United Nations in the establishment of Communist-controlled governments, such as Poland.

Mr. BREHM. Would the gentleman go so far as to wage war against Russia in order to stop its advancement, if necessary? Suppose our intervention fails, which in my opinion it will fail, then would the gentleman go so far as to have a war with Russia?

Mr. MERROW. If this policy fails we may be forced into war, because if Russian domination continues, how are we going to avoid it when she gains control of the Mediterranean, when she cuts off the oil in the Middle East, and when she goes down and takes India and tries to extend her influence all over the world?

Mr. BREHM. In my humble opinion—and I do not want to be accused of being an isolationist by this remark, because I do not think there is such a word any more—I would keep strong internally. I would be strong by having a two-ocean navy; I would make America the greatest Nation on earth, and I would protect the Western Hemisphere. There could be no wars unless America financed them, as she has done in the past. I would be strong here and say, "Do not

tread on me," and if we maintain that position and stop financing wars, we can also stop communism and bring lasting peace to a troubled world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. In response to what the gentleman from Ohio has said, let me state that I am in accord when he talks about making the United States strong. As far as staying at home and minding our own business is concerned, which is a phrase often used, we tried that when Mr. Hitler was rising to power. We, of course, did not take any action when he occupied the Rhineland. It was not our business, yet we were forced into war, were we not?

Mr. BREHM. If England and France had gone along with us things would have been different. We offered to stop Hitler then. The gentleman knows we did. Our Secretary of State at that time absolutely made a proposition to Great Britain, "Let us tell Hitler off now; let us stop him now." But they refused to go along with us. Instead of that Great Britain went ahead and financed Hitler to arm for the next war with money which the United States loaned or gave to Great Britain.

I return to my original premise. If we stop financing these damnable wars they will stop existing and so will communism which breeds and thrives in war's aftermath.

Mr. MERROW. We should not finance wars, but let us not forget that we were not ready and we were not willing to fight when Mr. Hitler invaded the Rhineland. Let us not forget also that the Soviet Union, with three times the territory of the United States, is potentially more powerful than we are. I would not be so much alarmed about Russia if it were not for the principle that underlies the whole Marxian philosophy, that capitalism and democracy must be destroyed. If we do not act in this crisis, what is going to happen? The Communists, trained in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria and the rest of the Balkans, will take over Greece. As soon as they take over Greece there is nothing to prevent Turkey's downfall. As soon as Turkey is gone then the Middle East is in danger. You would be surprised to see the fear in the hearts of the people of the Middle East, fear of Soviet pressure, which, according to my information, is constantly increasing. When the Middle East goes, and the oil of the Persian Gulf, our security will be imperiled. In a short time we are going to be an oil-importing nation. Great inroads were made on our reserves during the last war. If the Mediterranean Sea becomes a Soviet lake, and the Middle East is dominated by Russia, and India falls to the Soviets, and Russia takes France and Spain, trouble will certainly be brought very close to our doors.

Mr. BREHM. I believe if we had had the atomic bomb at the time that Mussolini went into Albania and over into Ethiopia, and at the time that Hitler went into Poland, and at the time that Hirohito went into Manchuria, and we had said to those men at that time, "Now, you get back in your shell and you stay there or we are going to drop an atom bomb on you," they would have gone back home and stayed back home, and World War II would never have occurred. If this loan of \$400,000,000 is eventually going to lead us into war with Russia, then I think we should be realistic and say to Stalin, "Now, brother, you pull out and get back home or we are going to drop a bomb on you now." We might as well have a showdown now as in the future, and save \$400,000,000 of our money in so doing as well as thousands of our young men and women. I never went in much for bluffing, so if we really intend to stop communism then let us stop it and not make an idle gesture by furnishing more money and lend-lease goods to further it.

Mr. MERROW. The gentleman and I are in pretty close agreement on some matters at least. I feel that we had better have a show-down now, because it is going to cost us much less money to do so at the present time than if we wait until sometime in the future.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am sorry I did not hear the entire discourse of the gentleman. I should like very much to have heard it all. In discussing this Greek-Turkish loan especially, I think that is the wrong way to try to stop communism. I think communism is a threat in the world today because we have permitted communism to feed and finance itself off other nations and to feed and finance itself primarily from the Treasury of the United States. I am of the firm and frank opinion that if we want to stop communism and destroy communism, it will stop and destroy itself if we quit feeding and financing it. For instance, if we had not given that Communist Tito \$650,000,000, today he would not be a threat to the peace of Greece and Turkey. What makes my blood boil, for instance, is this: We hear talk about stopping communism at the same time that UNRRA officials were making arrangements to provide \$75,000,000 more for Communists in China on the very day that the President here was asking for \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey, and a representative of our State Department was asking for \$25,000,000 more to send to Russia. Now, what kind of business do you call that?

Communism has thrived; communism has succeeded; and communism has become a threat to the peace of the world because it has had access to the Treasury of the United States of America, and if we wake up and quit financing it and feeding it, it will crumble.

I am of the honest opinion that if we had not bolstered the Communist government in France with \$750,000,000, the people of France would have overthrown that government a long time ago. The

same applies to Tito. If we had not given him \$650,000,000, the people of Yugoslavia would have overthrown him a long time ago, and you would not have communism in Yugoslavia.

We do not have to fight communism. We do not have to go to war to stop communism. It will die; it will rot; it will destroy itself if we are just smart enough to quit feeding and financing it. Let us stop talking about stopping communism, but let us talk about stopping the financing of it, and then communism will not be a threat throughout the world.

Mr. MERROW. Whereas I am in agreement with the gentleman as far as stopping the financing of communism is concerned, that is only a part of this broad over-all picture. However, it would not be an argument against our action in Greece and Turkey in the Mediterranean area. What you have said in reference to the situation in Yugoslavia is correct. As for the situation in Yugoslavia, a year ago I introduced a resolution to investigate the operations of UNRRA. Yes, I agree that we must stop financing communism. That is a part of this picture.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. I have been greatly interested in the discourse of the gentlemen. If I am informed correctly, since the time we went into Greece after the Germans withdrew, and our Government with the British Government has been in command there, we have expended some \$700,000,000 in a country with a population equivalent to the city of New York. Now, we propose further expenditures. The question comes to mind, so far as the expenditure of money is concerned: When do we start holding back communism? Another question comes to mind. The same minds and the same hands that have been in Greece for these 2 or 3 years will be the same minds and the same hands that will continue to dish out our dollars. How can we hope to improve the situation under those circumstances.

Mr. MERROW. We need safeguards in spending money in Greece. If we do not assist Greece, then that Communist minority which is armed and ready to take over will seize the country. Then, Greece will be in the Moscow orbit. It is well for us to keep in mind that the only place there is an opportunity for Anglo-American influence to exert itself in the entire Balkan area is in tiny Greece.

Mr. ELLIS. I hold in my hand a news item by the Associated Press this morning's newspapers from London where they quote a high British authority as stating that the American State Department is taking a graver view of the Greek situation, a much graver view, than the British, and that while the guerilla operation is a nuisance they do not consider it as grave as a civil war and they do not believe their withdrawal will necessarily deliver the Greek Government to the Communists. That is the news statement that I hold in my hand.

Mr. MERROW. That is exceedingly optimistic. The Communists are well

trained and well organized. There is a tremendous relief problem in Greece. By establishing a stable economy there, we are going to have a country which will resist the threat of communism. But the strategic political implications of this situation are so important that we must devote our attention to what will happen if the Mediterranean goes into other hands.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. How far does the gentleman propose to fight communism? Would you extend that program to include France, Italy, China, India, Spain, and Korea? Has anybody given this Congress or the American people an estimate of how many billion dollars it would take to do that?

Mr. MERROW. No; I do not think we have at the moment; but this is certain: If we do not begin somewhere, you have an alternative, and that alternative is that the countries you have named will be taken over by a power that is unfriendly to us.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Is there any record in history anywhere that the mere spending of billions of dollars has stopped communism? Can you point to any nation or any country in Europe where that has happened? Has it done it in France or in China?

Mr. MERROW. In order to answer your questions, it is necessary to take into consideration the rehabilitation of the economies in the countries you have mentioned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Merrow] has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that from now on at least we ought to loan our money on a business basis?

Mr. MERROW. Exactly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Under lend-lease I maintained, and I still maintain, it should have been on a business basis.

Mr. MERROW. I agree all aid should be on a business basis.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If Russia had been loaned money with the understanding that we should get something back, we would have had a different situation.

Mr. MERROW. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Instead of draining us and draining us as she is today, and not cooperating.

Mr. MERROW. If we had settled some of these problems while extending aid, it would have been much easier.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. From now on we should have a different policy; a self-respecting policy.

Mr. MERROW. Exactly.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE DOES NOT BYPASS THE UNITED NATIONS

The program of extending aid to Greece and Turkey does not bypass the United Nations. To be perfectly realistic, we are involved in power politics outside the United Nations. It is exceedingly important that every American recognizes this. To wait until negotiations with the UN could be completed before aiding Greece would cause unnecessary hardship for the Greeks. Congress is spending weeks debating before acting. An even longer delay would be experienced in the UN. It would become a case of too little and too late. Such a delay could easily be construed by Turkey as British and American indifference about the Dardanelles and the Black Sea. Such indifference might prompt Turkey to yield to the aggressive demands of Russia.

The United Nations organization is impotent to act in the Mediterranean crisis. The organization does not have an armed police force, it is without agencies for law enforcement and it is not in a position to extend financial aid or other assistance to countries in danger of totalitarian aggression. The existing UN agencies as now constituted are inadequate to deal with the proposed assistance in all its aspects. It has been argued by some that the Food and Agricultural Organization and the International Bank could handle the entire matter efficiently. Neither of these agencies are organized to carry out the work. The Economic and Social Council, under which the FAO operates, is only advisory and the International Bank is still in the process of organization. Furthermore, the latter has not contemplated handling financial matters of the kind here in question. To depend on these two agencies would spell trouble for the program.

The veto power, which Russia has used not once but 10 times—and most recently in the case of Albania—is an illustration of what we can expect were this issue referred to the United Nations. To give the question to the United Nations could very well result in Russia using her veto power to check the needed aid. It is true that according to article 27, paragraph 3 of the Charter, that any member of the Security Council "a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting." On the face of it, this would seem to be a positive check on the use of the veto in this case. But this view is not correct. The clause in question is only applicable to chapter VI, which deals with the "Pacific Settlement of Disputes," and to paragraph 3, article 52, which is concerned with "Regional Arrangements." It does not include chapter VII, which is devoted to "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of



aggression." Thus by insisting that the loans have a strategic and combative significance—which President Truman has openly admitted they do possess—Russia would be able to use the veto, and the United States would be faced with a choice between her own strategic interests and a breach of the UN Charter. Referring this problem to the UN would be disastrous and end in complete failure.

Strategic and tactical considerations are involved. The President's message occurred after General Marshall had reached Moscow and after the peace negotiations had begun. Russian diplomats were engaged in a blunt offensive on Britain and the United States evidently calculated to give them a favorable position in the negotiations of the Austrian and German treaties.

Russian forces occupy the major part of eastern Europe. Communism is being spread at a rapid pace in the Near and Middle East. Consciously or unconsciously the message was directed at Russia where she is the most vulnerable. It states in effect that the Black Sea ports and the Russian southwestern areas are wide open to attack by Britain and the United States if war should come. Likewise it places Russia on notice that even Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other Communist Balkan satellites—which there is reason to believe Russia thinks gives her control of the eastern Mediterranean—would be of no avail in a conflict between Russian and the Anglo-Saxon countries. Thus from the standpoint of political pressure the President's approach relieves pressure upon our diplomats in Moscow in a way that the United Nations could never have done.

The United States is the only country possessing the prestige, the ability and the power to act in this crisis. It is the only country capable of halting the march of communism and preventing a Soviet-dominated world. Those who contend that the UN has been bypassed and that the question should have been referred to it for action are simply beclouding the issue and are unwilling to face the facts in the serious international political situation. The program suggested by the President will strengthen the United Nations. To refer the question of Greek and Turkish aid to the United Nations would be another step along the road of postwar diplomatic appeasement which we have followed in our relations with the Soviet Union.

THE UNITED STATES DOES NOT WISH TO  
DOMINATE ANY NATION

The United States does not wish to force democracy on any people. Neither will we stand idly by and see the Soviet totalitarian regime pressed upon nation after nation by force. We do not object to the type of government Russia maintains in her own country. But the Stalin government influences the Soviet foreign policy so that it is aggressive and expanding. Our security is thus threatened and this causes us anxiety. When the Soviet Union insists that capitalism all over the world must be destroyed and that communism must replace it, it becomes a matter of grave concern to this

country. We wish people to be free to select their own governments. It is evident that were nations free to do this the people in many of the countries now under Russian-controlled puppet governments would not support these governments.

An illustration of the ruthless Russian methods is found in Poland. The events leading up to the elections in Poland on Sunday, January 19, 1947:

(a) Violated the third principle stated in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, to which the members of the United Nations are committed, namely:

They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

(b) Violated the purpose of the United Nations stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely:

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

And, (c), violated the agreements made at Yalta and at Potsdam. Russia has taken great pains to see that the Polish Government is Moscow-dominated and directed.

IF WE DO NOT ACT

Turkey and Greece are the outposts against the march of communism in the Mediterranean area. If we do not assist Greece, Communists trained in Yugoslavia and other Balkan States, taking their orders directly from Moscow, will seize control of the nation.

If Greece falls to the Moscow-controlled Communists, Soviet influence will soon extend to Turkey, the eastern Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the whole Middle East, and India. Spain will ultimately fall. Russia will soon have the western gateway to the Mediterranean and will be master of most of Europe. The Mediterranean Sea will become a Soviet lake. This will imperil the security of the United States.

We must act immediately, not for the purpose of underwriting the British Empire, but for the purpose of stopping the spread of communism, for the purpose of ensuring our security and for the purpose of maintaining our present position of world leadership for human freedom.

In an editorial of the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 18, 1947, published in Manchester, N. H., the critical international situation was admirably stated in these words:

If we do not assume leadership in these lands abandoned by Great Britain, there is no question as to whom will assume leadership there, and that will be Russia. They will impose on these lands a system which is the opposite of everything we stand for, and they will use these lands to strengthen them in their attempt at world domination.

Therefore, there is only one alternative. That is for America to move in and move in fast. This applies to Greece, to Turkey, and to the Near East. It applies to China. It applies to all those lands where Russia is

attempting to press on and overcome and destroy the independence of small states.

It applies also to the backward countries, such as India and Africa. In those countries the United States must assume a position of leadership.

The strategic importance of the Greek-Turkish question is well stated in an editorial which appeared in the Carroll County Independent of March 21, 1947, published in Center Ossipee, N. H. The editorial is as follows:

The discussion on help to Greece and Turkey goes on and on. While we are debating whether or no we shall help those countries, we are also debating whether or no we shall take our place as the world's leading power or hand that position over to Russia.

Russia is a powerful, expanding nation, ruled by men who are intensely ambitious. Russia's leaders secured their background and training in the pitiless school of European power politics. They are avaricious, cynical, and ruthless.

If we give Russia free rein in Europe we can expect to wake up 10, 15, or 20 years from now and find that Russia has organized, consolidated, and rebuilt Europe to further her own objectives with regard to no other nation or people.

In the States we have always considered England and France as our bulwarks against aggression. That is, they have always given us time to train and equip our armies.

Today France is disorganized, with no money, no equipment, and torn by political strife.

England is almost bankrupt. During the war she sold her investments in foreign lands to meet the expenses of defense. Her standard of living is almost lower than it was in wartime. She owes huge sums on her one-time colonies. She is withdrawing from some of her great possessions. In no sense can England be rated the great power that she was in 1937, 10 short years ago.

That puts the United States squarely on the spot. It is not a question of where the balance of power in the world is going to rest and who is going to have control of that power.

We in the United States have been luckier during the last three decades than any other people in the world. We have not been invaded, bombed, burned out, pillaged, or occupied as have nearly all the nations of Europe and great sections of Asia.

Because misfortune has never come to us is no reason that it cannot or will not come.

From now on we have no great nations to protect us while we prepare to resist an aggressor. We are strictly on our own.

AIR SUPREMACY

In 1945 I had an opportunity to travel thousands of miles with the ATC on an inspection trip to several theaters of warfare. I marveled at the tremendous might of the American air power. We had the finest planes and the best air fields all over the world. Our air strength was far beyond anything one could have imagined a few years before. After returning from the journey, which took us from London to New Delhi and from the Scandinavian countries to Cairo, I said on the floor of this House on January 22, 1946:

We have air supremacy everywhere in this world, and I think this air supremacy should be maintained at all costs. In other words, by maintaining air supremacy and by insisting upon it we can make the greatest contribution to the protection of American interests and the greatest contribution to the building of an organization which will preserve the peace of the future.

At the end of the second world war we had the largest, the best equipped, the best fed, the best clothed and the most efficient Army in the world. We had the largest Navy. We possessed the greatest industrial machine. We had the most effective striking power ever developed—and what did we do? We, a Nation of extremes, established the world's record for demobilization, for dismantling our armed strength and for stripping ourselves of power so necessary in the modern world. The amazing and rapid scuttling of our strength and the all too swift demobilization of our forces will be recorded by future historians as one of the greatest tragedies to ever befall the republic.

It is not too late to regain our strength and to retrieve the position we have lost. We must develop a powerful Army, continue to maintain the largest Navy in the world and ensure air supremacy at all costs. Air supremacy by the United States in this day of guided missiles and atom bombs, will be one of the greatest guarantees in maintaining peace.

To emphasize the points I am making I am including an editorial from the *Evening Star*, published in Washington, of April 4, 1947, entitled "Our Air Strength":

Not long ago the United States had by far the greatest air strength in the world. Today, however, it does not have as many operational planes as Russia. Indeed, according to Senator BREWSTER, its military aviation is rapidly falling behind not only Russia's but Britain's as well.

Of course, with the war over, there is no reason why our armed forces should have scores of thousands of planes. If the Russians and the British are ahead of us merely in quantity, Senator BREWSTER's statement need not be taken too seriously. Numbers alone do not count for much if they cover only the types of planes used against the Axis—types that may be regarded as largely obsolete now. What counts is quality, plus the ability to convert readily to the production of advanced aircraft of every description. If we hold the lead in that respect, we can feel reasonably secure.

The truth seems to be, however, that we are not holding the lead. At any rate, Senator BREWSTER's statement has been underscored by some highly disturbing figures from General Echols, our wartime deputy chief of air staff for procurement. According to General Echols, our plane production in 1946—a total of 1,330 military planes and 467 transports—was worse than in peacetime 1939, when we built 2,500 aircraft. In his judgment if something isn't done about the situation, and quickly, we're going to be right back to the point we reached after World War I when we had only three manufacturers in the business. To support this warning, he has estimated that we are now turning out only about 400 plane engines a month, with half of these produced by a single company. As he sees it, most of our heavy aircraft industry is operating in the red, and the danger is that little will be left of it, or of its know-how, if it continues to lose money and is deprived of other incentives.

In terms of the future, this is a potentially serious situation. We cannot keep on producing planes at the wartime rate, but certainly there ought to be a systematic minimum flow of orders for new and experimental types—orders designed to give us a lead as regards both the quality of our aviation and our ability to convert swiftly to large-scale

output. The air age makes this a security essential.

on.

Failure to adopt the President's program for extending aid to Greece and Turkey means that Soviet Russia with her foreign policy of expansion and aggression will control the Mediterranean Sea and the Middle East.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman take the position that if Russia does not heed our entrance into Greece this country is prepared to go to war immediately; and is the gentleman willing to go to the American people and tell them that when we send military forces there we are not fooling, we are not kidding, that we are actually getting into a military, aggressive war?

Mr. MERROW. If that situation arises I will face the problem very frankly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious that this will imperil American and other western oil interests in the Middle East. To make sure that this vast source of power remains in thoroughly friendly hands we must be firm and resolute. During World War II great inroads were made on the oil reserves in the United States. About 80 percent of the Allied supply of petroleum was furnished by the United States. In addition to this we fueled the war machine in the United States. In the event of future trouble the loss of the almost illimitable supply of oil in Arabia could well be crucial. To protect our national interests and to help guarantee our security we must not allow the Middle East to be overrun by a power whose actions clearly indicate an unflinching determination to dominate all the earth. It is not only oil but vital sea and air routes which are involved. We do not wish to wake up some morning and find the world broken in two in the Middle East area.

The estimated oil reserves in the Middle East according to the *New York Times* are as follows: Arabia and Bahrain, 6,000,000,000 barrels; Iran, 6,000,000,000 barrels; Iraq, 4,750,000,000 barrels; Kuwait, 4,000,000,000 barrels; and Qatar, 500,000,000 barrels.

In 1941 the United States had a reserve productive capacity of over 1,000,000 barrels a day. This was dissipated during the war and at the present time our domestic resources are being overproduced to the extent of 200,000 to 300,000 barrels a day. During the past 8 years the discovery of new reserves has fallen short of our requirements domestically. The United States in the

near future will be forced to look to foreign petroleum resources for a large part of our petroleum requirements. Since oil is essential for our economy, it is clear that the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf area are of grave importance to every man, woman, and child in the United States. Oil affects everyday living and were it not for petroleum and its products life would be much less pleasant. In preventing Russia from overrunning the Middle East we are acting in the interests and for the well-being of every American.

Cabell Phillips, in an article recently published in the *New York Times* on oil in the Middle East, stated:

According to the best estimates available in Washington today, private United States investments in the countries of the Middle East—Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Bahrain—total about \$250,000,000. Between 90 and 95 percent of these investments are in oil, and these oil holdings are concentrated in the hands of the four or five titans of the United States petroleum industry.

In its simplest terms, the Middle East is a vital source of a vital military commodity—oil. Already it is fueling and lubricating our entire naval force in the far Pacific, using but a fraction of its vast potential for the purpose. It is the major source of supply for Britain. Should that source be cut off, the British Navy would be brought virtually to a standstill. And for every barrel of the "liquid gold" pumped from the ancient sands of Arabia by American drillers, an equivalent amount of this country's waning reserves stays in the ground in Texas and Oklahoma.

With the might of the British Empire steadily declining throughout the region, the Soviet Union, whose borders impinge upon the Middle East at the Caspian Sea, emerges as the great power tactically situated to exert its dominance.

Last year the "Azerbaijan incident" sent shudders through the spines of British and American statesmen and military leaders. It is not too much to suppose that it is against a repetition of that event, and upon a grander and more catastrophic scale, that the Truman doctrine is aimed.

Thus, whatever the private commercial stakes of American investors in the Middle East may be, national security remains the overriding consideration of our new policy there.

When in 1950 the proposed 1,000 mile, 30- and 31-inch pipe line, at a cost of \$115,000,000 extending from Saudi Arabia through Trans-Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria to the Mediterranean, is completed the production of oil will be stepped up from 200,000 barrels a day to 500,000 barrels a day.

We must not allow the security of the United States to be endangered by the possible cutting off of this oil supply. We must prevent the Mediterranean and the Middle East from falling into the hands of a power who refuses to honor her agreements and whose policy is, through Moscow-dominated Communist parties, to control the entire world.

ACTION NOW WILL PREVENT A THIRD WORLD WAR

By aiding Greece and Turkey we will call the bluff of the Soviet Union. The Russian foreign policy of expansion, of spreading communism, and of world domination will be checked without the



firing of a gun or the shedding of a drop of blood. Russia is in no position to fight at the moment but may be in such a position 15 or 20 years from now. Let us not forget that potentially the Soviet Union is the strongest power in the world and were she on an industrial par with the United States we would have much to fear. I have long been pleading for a firm and realistic foreign policy. I believe that action now will definitely prevent a third world war. Let us not forget recent history. Firm and resolute action before Nazi Germany occupied the Rhineland in 1936 or before the many other annexations of territory by Germany would have, in my opinion, avoided the second world war. This is an all too recent bitter lesson of history. We must move now and move quickly in an effort to stop another world war, yes, in an effort to save millions of American lives in the future.

#### DIPLOMATIC APPEASEMENT

There must be an end to diplomatic appeasement. The agreement that Pola, an Italian naval base at the Istrian tip of the Adriatic, should go to Yugoslavia, the agreement that Russia should collect German assets in Austria as reparations, and the splitting of Germany into three zones are glaring examples of our attempts to appease the Russian bear. Many more illustrations could be presented. The more we appease, the more Russia wants. Her appetite for expansion can never be satiated.

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR LEADERSHIP

We now have an opportunity to exercise world leadership. By doing this, we will make it possible for nations to select the type of government they wish. By rising to this historical occasion, we will prevent the spread of totalitarianism and will help guarantee freedom in this world. We must make an unyielding stand for liberty. We should move at once and with determination. It will be far less expensive to act now than sometime in the future. By being firm and realistic, we will be able to prevent a third world war. I, for one, am not willing to see, through our timidity, hesitancy, and unwillingness to make a bold, decisive move, the center of political gravity shift from Washington to Moscow. This is precisely what will happen if we do not act now.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### HIGH PRICE LEVELS NECESSARY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am much concerned, but not surprised, at the sudden drive on the part of the eastern interests to bring

down our raw materials price levels. This is very reminiscent to me of what happened in May 1920, during the last year of the Wilson administration. We should proceed with extreme caution before we decide as a nation to again allow anything other than the law of supply and demand to dictate our price levels.

Our national income finds its source in the new wealth production from our natural resources. During the past 25 years our gross farm income has been in an almost direct ratio of \$1 of farm income to \$7 of national income. To those of us who come from the Middle West the fact is well known that the gross farm income of the Nation is the weathervane of our country's prosperity. At no time in the history of the United States have we had a depression or unemployment with farm prices at parity or above.

With \$259,000,000,000 of national debt, accompanied with a minimum probably of from twenty-five to thirty billions of dollars for the next 10 years as a national budget, we cannot afford to permit our national income to fall much below the figure that today is prevalent. The drive on the part of Eastern interests to knock down the prices of raw materials for their own selfish purposes will eventually result in a Nation-wide slump in prosperity. All of the new wealth in our Nation is created from the production of our farms, forests, and mines, and lower prices for this production simply means to me the forerunner of a depression. Frankly, with our enormous national debt, and our necessarily high budget, we cannot afford at this time, above all, to risk a depression through unwise price manipulation.

It is my opinion that the Members of Congress from the raw material producing States should be alert to protect our future interests, and the foundation of our national income, from the attacks of those who, for selfish reasons, can see only their own immediate interests. Neglect on our part may find us going back to the price level of the 1930's, and that, with our national debt and budget conditions such as they are, will result in national bankruptcy.

If we wish to give the rest of the world peace and prosperity, which so many so glibly talk about and promise, our first step must be to protect our own price level and our own national prosperity. With a bankrupt United States the rest of the world will be plunged into chaos.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out the fallacy that exists in the minds of the American public that higher farm prices mean increase in the cost of living. The reverse is true.

A 10-percent increase in farm income results in 10-percent increase in national income as farm prices increase. As a result, the percentage of the national income spent for food when farm prices are low is greater than when farm prices are high.

For the record, I would like to present a tabulation which shows the percentage of national income spent for food during the period 1929-45.

The figures for 1946 are not yet available but can be estimated at approximately 22 percent.

Year	Expenditure for food (billions)	National income (billions)	Percent of national income
1929.....	\$19.0	\$83.3	22.8
1930.....	18.5	68.8	26.9
1931.....	15.4	54.4	27.7
1932.....	12.1	39.9	30.3
1933.....	11.4	42.3	27.0
1934.....	12.5	49.4	25.3
1935.....	13.9	55.7	24.9
1936.....	15.2	64.9	23.4
1937.....	16.2	71.5	22.5
1938.....	15.1	64.2	23.3
1939.....	15.3	70.8	21.5
1940.....	16.5	77.8	21.2
1941.....	19.0	95.6	19.8
1942.....	23.8	121.5	19.5
1943.....	27.8	147.9	18.8
1944.....	30.4	160.7	18.8
1945.....	31.8	161.0	19.7
1946.....	(1)	(1)	(1)

<sup>1</sup> Figures not available.

Source of data: U. S. Department of Commerce (Survey of Current Business).

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Drew Pearson and a letter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Inter-parliamentary Union"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.;

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.);

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; and S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

526. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$590,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 190); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

527. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 492. A bill to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment; with amendments (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 493. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); with amendments (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2659. A bill to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 3015. A bill to revoke the naturalization of persons who have been discharged from the United States Government service in compliance with Executive Order No. 9835; to deport such persons; and to deport aliens concerning whom the Attorney Gen-

eral knows or has reason to believe their presence in the United States may endanger the public safety or welfare of the country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3018. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3017. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3018. A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and promote peace; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, so as to permit the construction of public works on the Great Lakes for purposes of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3020. A bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 3021. A bill to authorize the patenting of certain lands which formed a part of the original Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation in Oklahoma to the city of Lawton, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3022. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3023. A bill providing for a Federal Employees' Loyalty Act of 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the services rendered to the cause of the American Revolution by Haym Salomon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. Res. 176. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 177. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 176; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to discrimination against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3024. A bill for the relief of James W. Taylor 3d; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3025. A bill for the relief of Robert Ernest Beadle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3026. A bill for the relief of Simon J. Kirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

321. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the common council of the city of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request to expedite the passage of S. 866, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come in prayer to Thee, Lord Jesus, who never had to take back anything spoken, to correct anything said, or to apologize for any statement. Wilt Thou have pity upon our frailties and deliver us from pitying ourselves.

Bless the Members of this body as they think together and work together in this Chamber, in committee rooms, and in their offices. Help them to stand up under the strains and the tensions of problems and decisions, of meetings and conferences, and the endless demands made upon them. Teach them how to relax and to take time to turn to Thee for guidance and for grace, and thus discover the secret of power. In Thy name we ask it. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 10, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its